

Novice

Parli

Aff

Olive CD

	spts	Rank
PM Neha Dhey	25.5	2
WP Ishika Chouda	24	3

Neg
Prospect Cu

	spts	Rank
LO Austin Wang	26	1
MO Akshay	25	3

Comments:

- Aff' was vague → said things but didn't back them up
 → resolving conflicts of UN law?
 →

- both definitions of "conflict" were kind of abusive
 but went with the Aff's

in the end, I didn't want to give up the
 specific Con rights (lawyer, 3 branches of SC)
 which the aff conceded, we would lose
 in last speech
 if when in war.

Flight 8
Mission C
2:00
Novice Parli

B

AAA

0 HV Chi WH

Han 29

3

Wang 24

4

Meg Leland

Meg

Leland KK

Kang 25

Kshirsagar 25

For me, this debate came down to the impacts of saving American soldiers' lives vs. saving those of innocent civilians when drones are used. No one gave me a scope with which to view this debate, so I am left to use that of the U.S. gov't because it is the actor in this case. Had I been given utilitarianism in the framework, then it would've gone to the AAA. However, I think the U.S. gov't has more of a commitment to ~~its~~ its troops rather than foreign civilians.

Aff

Olive CD

	Spts	Rank
PM Nenu Debey	25.5	2
WP Ishika Chawla	24	4

Neg

Prospect CW

	Spts	Rank
LO Austin Wang	26	1
MO Akshay	25	3

Comments:

- Aff' was vague → said things but didn't back them up
 → resolving conflicts of UN now?
 →

- both definitions of "conflict" were kind of abusive
 but I went with the Aff's

- in the end, I didn't want to give up the
 specific Con. rights (lawyer, 3 branches of govt)
 which the aff conceded we would lose
 in last speech
 if when in war.

- Aff: always have specifics this was one of the main

① ~~1~~. USFG s substantially decrease its aid to Israel.

~~2~~ USFG s significantly increase security in its middle Eastern embassies

~~3~~ USFG s leave no residual forces in Afghanistan when it withdraws

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Team	POINTS	RANKS
	DiaVal JY		
1	Paul Jeon	30	1
2	Brandon Ye	29	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Team	POINTS	RANKS
	NotDam LW		
1	Caroline Liongasari	28	4
2	Elizabeth Wu	28	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from DiaVal JY
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:

• Affirmation evaluated the debate with net benefits; ~~but~~ provided substantial evidence - dates, statistics, flaws

- example: 67% of Am prefer economic growth
- 70% of EPA prefer environmental protection

• Negative did refute points, but needed more net benefits than Aff in order to win the debate

- example: Hurricane sandy, how many people were effected by this?
- good job providing link between environment protection to preventing national disasters · Human pollute → climate change = natural disaster

• Overall the affirmation did a great job pointing out flaws from opponents debate ie: no real impact, no stats, thus cannot assume impact

I voted aff because of the value on net benefits. - Neg, next time could turn the value around on them.

speaker evaluation:

Paul: very confident! great job :)

Elizabeth: great job, providing links to what you are refuting very fluid! :)

Brandon: great a little louder speaker next time! :)

Carly: confident speaker, more eye contact would be nice 😊

B

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	NotDam YN	POINTS	RANKS
1	Czarina Yip	25	1
2	Divya Nikkanti	25	2

NEGATIVE

POS	OliChi DP	POINTS	RANKS
1	Julia Park	24	4
2	Gaurisha Dewan	25	3

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

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative

- C1: safety of our people
 - congress needs to protect the people
 - resource
 - investing
- C2: terrorist
 - Afghan

* ~~votes~~ voters issue
 • extending C4

- C3: strengthening security in U.S.
 - threats from other countries
- C4: National security 1st
 economic interests 2nd
 - 38% prioritize n.s. over anything else

Negative

- C1: national economy leads to national security
 - no \$ no troops
 - no \$ no weapons
 - 70% \$
- C2: economic interest first will take care of national security
 - \$ funds national security
 - security is a necessity but \$ funds it
 - ↳ exploitation of tax might lead to national depression

basic needs + national security vs.
 national security ≠ few basic needs

Room: Mission A
Start: 12:30
Novice Parliamentary

A

2

Nagakumar, Jines
Vinchure Aarati - EVHS

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	BisOD CM	POINTS	RANKS
1	Shawn Cunningham	27.5	1
2	Hailey McKenna	27.5	2

NEGATIVE

POS	SumPrep DG	POINTS	RANKS
1	Sean Decker	25	4
2	Elsa Gernand	26.8	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from Shawn Cunningham & Hailey McKenna
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Aarati

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1. AFF. provided proper examples to prove their point
2. AFF understood the subject and provided good arguments
3. Very confident & participants from on AFF side.
4. Neg. side didn't have clear understanding of the subject.

B

2

Nagakumar, Jines

Vinchure Aarati - EVHS

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	OliChi LW	POINTS	RANKS
2	Richard Liu	27.5	2
1	Brendan Wu	29.1	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Leland WP	POINTS	RANKS
2	David Webb	27	3
1	Grace Phan	27	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Richard Liu & Brendan Wu
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Aarati

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF - very confident & polite. Good arguments to the point.
 very clear understanding of the subject.

Neg. side didn't have proper ex. examples to prove their point.
 Neg. = need to be courteous to the opponent team -

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

"When in conflict, U.S. citizens should ~~not~~ prioritize national security interests over economic interests."

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	BisOD SJ	POINTS	RANKS
1	Ryan Seideman	27.3	3
2	Anna Johnson	27.6	1

NEGATIVE

POS	OliChi WH	POINTS	RANKS
2	Andre Wang	27.5	2
1	Eric Han	27	4

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

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

Signed: Paul Sankowsky

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

To me, NEG did the better job of undermining the resolution by tying national security to a strong economy (no national security without a strong economy providing funds for it), and pointing out that our military is already the strongest in the world. NEG also reasoned well against the assertion that national security is "funded by the government, not the economy" by pointing out that government funds (taxes) are tied to the economy. Also, I didn't really understand AFF's argument that prioritizing economic interests will necessarily equate human life with a dollar value.

Both sides could work on developing and extending their arguments (and refutation of opponent's arguments) rather than keep repeating their points.

A good job by both sides. Keep it up!

Room: Mission B
Start: 12:30
Novice Parliamentary

2

Ritchie, Lorrene

A
SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

"When in conflict, U.S. citizens should prefer economic growth over environmental protection."
11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Saratoga AX	POINTS	RANKS
1	David Akeley	27	4
2	Kelly Xiao	27.5	3

NEGATIVE

POS	OliChi AB	POINTS	RANKS
1	Vikshar Athreya	28	2
2	Prachit Bhike	28.1	1

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

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

Signed: Paul Lombowsky

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: It was not quite clear ^{to me} how war is completely related to the issue of a conflict between economic growth and environmental protection. It would have helped for you to outline how protecting the environment could cause harm by taking jobs, making people suffer, etc.

NEG: Great enthusiasm in your speaking. Your strongest argument (to me) was about the "big picture" of how the environment is of highest importance and even the economy depends on it.

Both sides made some good points. Keep on going, everyone!

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	JamLog KC	POINTS	RANKS
	Hamza Khawaja	28.1	4
	Sahil Chawla	28.2	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Everg DB	POINTS	RANKS
	Anh Diep	29.5	1
	Priya Bhattacharjee	29	2

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: Suzanne Yang

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Negative developed a coherent argument and followed it throughout its presentation. Negative had a good ability to refute the arguments affirmative put forth - they systematically went through each example/argument that was made by affirmative. Negative team made good eye contact and engaged with the judge better. Affirmative seemed to go astray from the basic premise of the argument. Aff. was focused on the fact that politicians are corrupt but did not actually argue for why integrity is more important than effectiveness. Affirmative had good speaking skills, and found a lot of examples very quickly, but did not tie them in well to the basic premise. I also liked how Neg. framed the argument - both are important - this was not addressed by aff (not refuted)

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	NotDam AC	POINTS	RANKS
	Kimia Ashktorab	21.5	3
	Melissa Cuevas	21	4

NEGATIVE

POS	SumPrep IG	POINTS	RANKS
	Liam Isaacs	28.8	1
	Nathaniel Griffin	28.1	2

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

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

Signed: S Yang

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The negative team won because they had more examples and reasons for their position. They explained why the economy promotes national security. However, negative did not address why the reverse is also true

Liam on the negative team has a good delivery - very conversational and easy to follow

Kimia needs to be sure she makes more eye contact
Melissa needs to work on her flow of speech - using "ums" during pauses

Nathaniel lost his place a few times but was able to recover - his use of hand gestures was a bit distracting

Finally, Affirmative was not able to fill all the time with their arguments - need to develop more arguments and examples

Room: Mission C
Start: 12:30
Novice Parliamentary

B

2

22, Leland Judge

NDSJ

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

When in conflict, U.S. citizens should value human rights over life.

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Saratoga CP	POINTS	RANKS
2nd	Sabrina Chen	26	1
1st	Sonal Rai	26	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Wash SV	POINTS	RANKS
2nd	Rahual Sheth	26	4
1st	Anirudh Veeraragavan	26	2

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

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative teams arguments were a bit off point and they didn't specifically say what type case this was "value" -

Neg stayed on one point - Aff. didn't state case therefore they should win. They presented no real rebuttal except for a cyclical argument Human rights is life therefore the other case makes no sense.

They should have gotten past the judging criteria and made a good case.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

When in conflict, US citizens should value integrity over effectiveness in their politicians
11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	POINTS	RANKS
Saratoga KS		
1st	Kunal Kanekar	25 25 24
2nd	Mihir Samdarshi	25 25 23

NEGATIVE

POS	POINTS	RANKS
Everg AG		
2nd	Basil Abushama	26.5 26.5 1
1st	Nihal Gowda	26.5 26.5 2

The better debating was done by the Neg from Saratoga Everg
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:

neither team addressed the actual topic - left out "when in conflict"

Affirmative: arguments did not enhance their own judging criteria - "utility"

- no points made the connection between moral/integrity and utility (greater good)
- also missed the question "when in conflict"

Negatives:

Basil - in particular - brought the point home - "affirmative has not proven greater good w any argument"

Roman empire example was a good point about effectiveness ~~and~~ with no morals

B

Evil

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	POINTS	RANKS
Leland KK		
Sohil Kshirsagar	26	3
Matthew Kang	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	POINTS	RANKS
JamLog CW		
Zachary Chee	21	4
Brian Wang	26	2

The better debating was done by the Aff from Leland KK
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 offered Comprehensive Case
Neg provided weak, less convincing argument
~~both sides~~

A

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	POINTS	RANKS
Everg LL		
Minh Le		
Nieman Liu		

NEGATIVE

POS	POINTS	RANKS
BisO'D PD		
Kendall Post		
Bryce Dewitt		

The better debating was done by the NEG from BisO'D Pd
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative is a "no show"