

Noice

Parli

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	OliChi DP	POINTS	RANKS
2	Julia Park	26	2
1	Gaurisha Dewan	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga KS	POINTS	RANKS
2	Kunal Kanekar	28	2
1	Mihir Samdarshi	28	1

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

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

Signed: Sunder Velamuri

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The NEG team was very effective at refuting the arguments of the AFF team. The NEG team cited relevant data and sources to justify their claims. The AFF team simply cited that prosecution as carried out by private parties and not govt. agencies. The AFF team made some good arguments but some experience will make them a winning team in the future.

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 WH	POINTS	RANKS
1	Andre Wang	260	2
2	Eric Han	240	4

NEGATIVE

POS	NotDam LW	POINTS	RANKS
1	Caroline Liongasari	25	3
2	Elizabeth Wu	27	1

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

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

Signed: Carolyn Hettrich

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

It was a very close debate!
 Neg was slightly more detailed in their articulation of the issues & had the advantage in defining & addressing the impact of the proposition.
 Great job to all participants!

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	Saratoga KS	POINTS	RANKS
1	Kunal Kanekar	20 25	2
2	Mihir Samdarshi	20 25	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Wash SV	POINTS	RANKS
2	Rahual Sheth	20 25	3
1	Anirudh Veeraragavan	20 21	1

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

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

Signed: Carolyn Hetrick

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Very close debate!

While Neg did not convince me with regards to ^{their} topicality, ^{argument} they very slightly edged out Aff with the consistency of their logic.

Aff: great job pushing details / evidence

Neg: exceptional job tracking + arguing ~~the~~ the more intricate arguments.

B

3

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

USFG Should slash agricultural subsidies
 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	27	1
2	Divya Nikkanti	27	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Leland WP	POINTS	RANKS
2	David Webb	27	3
1	Grace Phan	24	4

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: Subramanian

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: Aff

Defn → Burden → Contention
 1) Detrimental to the nation → fiscal impact
 2) " to farmers → corporate farms +
 3) Higher food costs
 Capitalism + free mkt are almost synonymous
 Hurts small farmers
 Czarina: Avoid redundancy - Last 2 mts of
 opening speech were repetitive. ~~over time~~
 by us

farmers motivation - a good point
 but it does not lead to bad food
 6:03 mts.

Aff vote: While your evidence
 was repetitive, Neg did not
 present adequate counter
 evidence.

Neg

Subsidies have no bearing on food
 quality/safety.
 → Refutation of contentions were merely
 a why question
 → Unclear on connection b/w subsidies
 & junk food/ GMOs??
 GDP is not profit coming into the US.
 It is a measure of total expenditures.
 A: 55 mt - speech

Good point on diff. b/w domestic
 vs. imported.

David: Appreciate your gentlemanly
 + mature ~~appro~~ demeanor.
 Grace: Aggressive ≠ rude.
 Good point on agriculture being an
 integral part of US economy.
 David - great voice, + poise.
 Did not explain why food costs will ↑ -
 stated examples but the analysis was
 missing. 6:03

Tangential: Hunger strikes??
 Skinny people in Africa?? - Avoid
 hyperbole

A

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

USFG should significantly increase investment in ^{high} speed rail
 11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	OliChi AB	POINTS	RANKS
2	Vikshar Athreya	26	4
1	Prachit Bhike	27	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga CP	POINTS	RANKS
2	Sabrina Chen	28	2
1	Sonal Pai	28	1

Almost a tie

The better debating was done by the Neg from Saratoga CP
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
 ① Millions of jobs ② ↓ deficit ③ convenient transport for all ④ Energy efficient
 → good evidence on safety of high speed rail.
 → good evidence on UCB study.
 Avoid ~~stating~~ addressing the "judge" everytime.
 No definitions, no framework
Prachit: Very poised, good clarity.
 Evidence to support that job growth will continue?? You have a very distinct speaking style that if developed/trained will make you a strong debater.
 Where does the President get his data from?
 Great potential & passion - keep working on debate and I am positive you both will become accomplished debaters.
 Did not create a standard

Neg
 - Airplanes create pollution? → Backs
 - clearly addressed the 4 contentions of Aff.
 - CA example: effective
 - 10% of national debt in Japan: not that significant.
Sonal: Poised & deliberate delivery. Nicely done.
 Both of you were very polite but assertive opponents!
Sabrina: Great clarity, confident & persuasive! Persuasive
 Convincing evidence on Japan's fiscally ~~irresponsible~~ high speed rail.
 → Refutations were backed by data! - Nicely done!
 - Smt. speech was repetitive.

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	NotDam AC	POINTS	RANKS
2	Kimia Ashktorab	26	3
1	Melissa Cuevas	27	1

ENTIME

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga AX	POINTS	RANKS
4	David Akeley	26	2
3	Kelly Xiao	25	4.

ON TIME

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: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

"The USFG should provide a path to citizenship for illegal immigrants"
#2 TOPIC
AFF STRUCR #1, NEG #3

1. Neg did not refute the point till 2nd speaker and did not present a good reason to link economic welfare whereas AFF did a better job of linking the connection to encourage immigration. They directly tied this to taxes which is something the NEG team did not mention (refute) in their speeches.
2. NEG's point about education costs was very good but they could not bring it home as they also stated - voting by lower ~~educated~~ educated persons would be resulting in poor leadership choices.

Speakers notes: Its noisy so please check if opponents & judge can hear you.
 #1: Initially hesitant, finished very strong. Good eye contact, carried debate for team. Best speaker.
 #2: Good diction. Fluent speaker.
 #3: Soft speaker. Some points were hard to hear in noisy environment. Kept good focus on points. Try not to say 'perhaps' as it can concede opponents' point.
 #4: Very clear speaker with good volume. Bit distracting, please stay seated. Keep up, the good speaking.

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	Everg AG	POINTS	RANKS
2	Basil Abushama	28	3
1	Nihal Gowda	27	4.

NEGATIVE

POS	BisOD CM	POINTS	RANKS
2	Shawn Cunningham	29	1
4	Hailey McKenna	28	2

gave topic #1

ARRIVED: 5:25 PM.

ARRIVED 5:20 PM.

The better debating was done by the NEG from BisOD
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 framework around net benefits was successfully argued against as NEG, in the environmental point.
- AFF framework was confusing as they affirmed that USFG 'should' slash without providing a plan to slash but using the current financial situation as a deadline.
- NEG's point of AGRI vs other industries ~~receiving~~ ^{receiving} subsidies was not refuted by AFF and they failed to make a clear definition of subsidies.

Speakers

- #1. Starts loud then tapers off a bit. Try to make more eye contact and read less off paper. Use your nervous energy and maintain volume.
- #2. Great speaker. Clear, loud and lucid. Enjoyed your animated finish.
- #3: (BASIL). Sorry for mispronouncing your name. Good speaker, loud and clear. Use more parliamentary language instead of "He said" or "You guys" (speaker #1)
- #4 very good speaker. Good eye contact.
- All: Enjoyed all of your speeches and interaction: Ask more questions than you have to clarify.

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 SJ	POINTS	RANKS
1	Ryan Seideman	29	3
2	Anna Johnson	30	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Everg DB	POINTS	RANKS
1	Anh Diep	30	2
2	Priya Bhattacharjee	28	4

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: *no real diff in speaking*

Signed: Mujda Alamzai (Nureen Khady)

USFG should increase border enforcement.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

Ryan - P.O. was a bit aggressive but correct
 - good voter issues

Anna - Great speaking, speak slower, fact check unemployment rate (+10%, it's 7.9%), lower voice when talking to partner

NEG

Anh - didn't take P.O., talk too loud to partner
 - great confidence and "supply/demand" was a good point
 - didn't rebut Aff's plan
 - besides their P.O., lots of new info

Priya - ignoring Aff point about bill imm. w/ their plan, good job taking Anna's question

*needed real voter issues - you crammed more arguments
 no talk of crime rates Aff mentioned*

I decided on the Aff team because the Neg had a pretty good case but dropped the Aff's plan and left a lot of points unaddressed. Also, the Neg team crammed ~~lots~~ crammed a lot of new arguments in their final speech. The Aff team had good voter issues and it was mainly the final speeches that determined the round for me.

I liked how both teams kept personal bias out.

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
2	OliChi LW Richard Liu	29	2
1	Brendan Wu	29	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Team	POINTS	RANKS
2	SumPrep DG Sean Decker	25	4
1	Elsa Gernand	26	3

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

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

Signed: Mujda Alamzai (Mujda Alamzai)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

USFG should replace the electoral college w/ a popular vote system. Decision reasoning: The Aff had clear concise points backed w/ examples. Neg needed stronger pts, more examples and to answer pols better.

Brendan - enthusiastic, good examples (2000 election & w/ v. CA), ~~clear~~
~~readers~~ no need to run over your words, good POIS, it's "candidate" - not "the first buy and second buy"

Richard - "one person, one vote" - good one, expanded more about issue about ↑ voter turnout, read less off your paper → more eye contact

Neg

Elsa - didn't adequately answer POI, doesn't seem to clearly understand the electoral college system, could have expanded on pts more
 ↳ own contentions

-lack of solid voter issues in final speech, you need more eye contact & confidence

Sean - never agree that the other team is right about unequal rights, be more confident on your points

In general, you needed more examples (neg)

B

Schneider, Ryan

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

AFFIRMATIVE

DiaVal JY	POINTS	RANKS
Paul Jeon	28	2
Brandon Ye	28.5	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Prospect SS	POINTS	RANKS
MO	Smith <i>Ashley</i>	23	4
LO	Smith <i>Austin</i>	26	3

The better debating was done by the *Aff* from *Diamond Valley*
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:

*Lack of links and overall weak contentions
Win for AFF*

27A	LO 26B	MO 28B	MO 23	LO 26B	PM
<i>Utilitarianism net benefits drug over died. 11% inc. pays</i>	<i>Agreed</i>	<i>Not in benefit we're stopping illegal immigration rather than legal immigration</i>	<i>Drugs will still be passed through borderlanders?</i>	<i>Legal process takes FOREVER!</i>	<i>Best</i>
<i>illegal immigra- tion billions</i>	<i>Driving out legitimate workers star drugs in USA</i>	<i>Aren't attacking root cause -massing the front- Mexico suffers US</i>	<i>?</i>	<i>?</i>	<i>Don't need plan Run syst power Valley/ntera no links!</i>
<i>national relation Mexican border borderline</i>	<i>spending a ton of money on their plan</i>	<i>Resolution is about America</i>	<i>?</i>	<i>?</i>	<i>Weak 1st round -stance economic what jobs? Why? Revenue inf needed!</i>
	<i>that relations, US trying to clamp down border</i>	<i>Sure they do, they have to support their family</i>	<i>Not like coming to get other jobs</i>		
	<i>1. Go away -take these jobs back nobody wants them jobs won't get done</i>	<i>Stopping illegal immigration will fix this</i>	<i>No savings?</i>		
	<i>2. Ineffective investment US. In a debt we can't afford this! Credit rating</i>	<i>See, there will be. But, we're fixing a lot of the problem</i>	<i>More ways to avoid border patrol</i>		
	<i>3. Can't stop all illegal immigrants no matter what</i>				

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	Team	POINTS	RANKS
2	JamLog CW Zachary Chee	25	3
1	Brian Wang	27	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Team	POINTS	RANKS
1	OliChi DP Julia Park	25	4
2	Gaurisha Dewan	26	2

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:

USFC should replace the electoral college with a popular vote system

Wang - good contentions, the aff is supposed to set a standard for definitions and the standard for voting, talk about impacts, good final speech

Park - clearly say what the other team says and then what you can rebut against it, good flow, don't read your paper

Chee - make sure to clarify your flow and emphasize your rebuttals, use all of your time!, don't drop points, answer all of them

Dewan - look at the judge because that's who you are convincing, good flow, good job poking holes at the aff case, use all of your time

Both teams need to turn their focus to net benefits and whose case is more important to uphold. All four teams need to stop reading their papers and work on convincing only the judge that their team presents a case that has less disadvantages. The neg had a good case but they didn't argue well enough.

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	Team	POINTS	RANKS
	JamLog KC		
2	Hamza Khawaja	27	4
1	Sahil Chawla	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Team	POINTS	RANKS
	SumPrep IG		
1	Liam Isaacs	29	1
2	Nathaniel Griffin	27	3

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

USFG should significantly increase border enforcement.

Sahil - define what kind of debate (value or fact or policy?), spend a lot of time focusing on your impacts. If the neg's case wins, why will it be bad? good final speech.

Liam - strong speaking, good use of impacts, you need to poke holes in the affirmative's plan

Hamza - pay clear attention to what your opposition says, you missed some stuff causing you to drop points

Nathaniel - don't move around so much; bring up net benefits and why the US can't increase border patrol, when you poke holes in the plan, be more specific.

The affirmative needs to perfect their flow because they aren't catching the negations points. Both teams should work on POIs. The negation was given a plan and did nothing with it successfully until their final two speeches. If the affirmative wants a plan, they should include way more details. The affirmative won based on emphasizing the ~~net~~ net benefits of their case towards the end.

AND answering, taking, asking

Sholnick, Ryan

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 CD	POINTS	RANKS
MG	Ishika Chawla	29	3
PM	Neha Dubey	22	4

NEGATIVE

POS	BisO'D PD	POINTS	RANKS
MD	Kendall Post	25	2
CO	Bryce Dewitt	18	1

The better debating was done by the Neg from BisO'D
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	NEG
<p>Don't forget framework/plan w/ DETAILS!</p> <p>framework. EVERYTHING has to tie into framework</p> <p>They don't want these jobs. Why not?</p> <p>Ask questions!</p> <p>Good charisma. Stay in control though relax a bit</p>	<p>They DO pay taxes</p> <p>Attach their lack of framework more</p> <p>Links. You need links!</p> <p>Ask questions!</p> <p>Need IMPACTS in your contentions</p> <p>Good use of hand gestures watch verbal fillers</p>	
<p>2 years, whichever way (7.7.7.7.7.)</p> <p>take jobs Americans won't.</p> <p>Morally wrong, NO money or time to apply practically</p> <p>Help the country. Pay 11.2 bit in taxes</p> <p>66% voters agree</p> <p>Steals opp. from citizens</p> <p>Rewards illegal</p>	<p>Failed to define Plan.</p> <p>Complete lack of framework</p> <p>still massive unemployment people can't be rich in word</p> <p>illegal immigrants don't pay taxes</p> <p>Nothing to do with our criteria</p> <p>still nothing to do with net benefits</p> <p>taking opp. for advancement jobs</p> <p>Still setting pres. off to break laws</p>	
<p>Policy round. Vague. No weighing mechanics "US vs G"</p> <p>take jobs from current citizens. High unemployment</p> <p>Doesn't work in a policy round</p> <p>Don't pay taxes or fight in military?</p> <p>Nothing to do with weight</p> <p>Steals opp. from citizens</p> <p>Bad president</p>	<p>Don't WANT these jobs</p> <p>children forced to live in foster home</p> <p>They DO pay taxes</p> <p>most believe this is a good thing.</p> <p>only taking jobs people don't want</p> <p>Help vs so much outweighs</p>	
<p>winners: NEGATIVE</p> <p>Framework and overall superior contentions and rebuttals</p>	<p>LO 25</p> <p>MG 23</p> <p>CO 27</p> <p>LO 26</p> <p>PM 22</p>	

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	Everg LL	POINTS	RANKS
1	Minh Le	26	1
3	Nieman Liu	24	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Leland KK	POINTS	RANKS
4	Sohil Kshirsagar	23	3
2	Matthew Kang	25	2

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

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

Signed: Delinda Dane

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

USFG should significantly increase investment in high speed rail.

Aff: 50 bil
 exceeds 100 mph ✓ (op 150 mph)
 net benefits - US citizens

① economic stimulus
 better the economy
 FDI infrastructure

\$1 = 2.5 dollar in return
 net 75 bil

(op save \$1 = wall mmo)

② HS rail efficient
 energy efficient
 green house gas