

NOVICE AND

OPEN POLICY

Advent Ashok

20, Leland Judge

Room: Kennedy 109 Start time: 3:00 pm

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL Prelim round 1

Instructions: For each speaker enter a Speaker Points score between 1 and 30. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Points. For each speaker enter a Speaker Rank score between 1 and 4. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Rank.

Aff: A & A			Neg: Chen & Boreckzy		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Contreas-Ramazzini, Hector	25	4	Chen, Tommie	26	3
Garcia, Diego	27	2	Boreckzy, Chance	28	1

Please circle the team that you intend to vote for. Check here to indicate a low point win is intended

Comments and reason for decision:

- As indicated in the start of the debate, I used stock issues in determining my judgment
- The topic raised was that ~~we~~<sup>we</sup> should fund an evacuation Mass transit system in New Orleans. A significant impact would be in helping ~~to~~ solve for race issues. The topic was "topical" though a lot of time was spent on discussing the what is allowed in the topic. There was also some credentials presented by speakers, this should not be done (but I did not consider it)
- Regards inherency, the fact that the disaster around Sandy shows there is significant fixes after Katrina, I went with the Aff as that may or may not address specific problems in New Orleans
- On solvency, I ~~was~~ voted with the Negative. There was no real substantial evidence to show that the Aff plan would work. Also, the fix in New Orleans ~~may~~ does not apply to the rest of US, it is specific to one city
- On disadvantage, I voted Neg. The fiscal cliff is a valid issue to not invest in ~~plans~~ ~~outside~~ of the specified plan. The fact that Obama won is not enough political capital, as there is still a divided ~~house~~ Congress.

**Kunes, Kevin**

Room: Kennedy 108 Start time: 3:00 pm

**SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational**

**POL Prelim round 1**

**Instructions:** For each speaker enter a Speaker Points score between 1 and 30. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Points. For each speaker enter a Speaker Rank score between 1 and 4. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Rank.

Aff: Tuggle-Whitemore			Neg: Wang & Pelcastre		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Tuggle, Emily	25	2	Wang, Michael	23	4
Whitemore, Cooper	25	3	Pelcastre, Jose	26	1

Please circle the team that you intend to vote for. Check here to indicate a low point win is intended \_\_\_\_\_

Comments and reason for decision:

*(RFD)*

Whitemore -  
 First constructive clear admissions, but inserts of 2nd and "essential" argument not clearly impacted. On the middle side same. Points had a strong case. (Kylor's conclusion) made sense. Solzner speech was strong, but together.

Tuggle  
 spent more time complaining about quality of the 2 course plans. But grievance was well presented. Caught 50 state test trap but did not find a water supply. Made one sweeping assumption about the Supremacy which vs Abilene was I feel overreaching. ~~Attack~~ of "Quality" was "Quality" argument was strong.

Pelcastre  
 a little disappointed when it didn't end. Capitalism was effective (takes note of work), not doing against the state. Speeches were well done, made examples of the economy, country.

Wang  
 response to cost, daily attack on the "You" does not describe money. Target on the plan was good, course was okay but didn't work well together. You can't run that team. Conclusion: Bad AND ~~perpetuating~~ <sup>strong</sup> good. Cost example was BRISQANT! I would like to see a cost history. good source of information, except said, did not combine that. It was poor and ~~it~~ <sup>it</sup> argued for attack of that assumption well.

Capara

MSJ-CX-02, MSJ-CX-02

Room: St. Clares 5 Start time: 3:00 pm

### SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

### POL Prelim round 1

Instructions: For each speaker enter a Speaker Points score between 1 and 30. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Points. For each speaker enter a Speaker Rank score between 1 and 4. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Rank.

Aff: Shangguan & Park			Neg: Siddiqui & Garg		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Park, Daniel			Garg, Aditya		
Shangguan, Henry			Siddiqui, Ammar		

Please circle the team that you intend to vote for. Check here to indicate a low point win is intended \_\_\_\_

Comments and reason for decision:

Forfeit for the Neg, no show @ 4:15 pm

USCA  
debate 2012 RA45  
P.S.  
DMZHEIF

Smith

MSJ-CX-01, MSJ-CX-01

Room: St. Clares 3 Start time: 3:00 pm

## SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

## POL Prelim round 1

Instructions: For each speaker enter a Speaker Points score between 1 and 30. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Points. For each speaker enter a Speaker Rank score between 1 and 4. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Rank.

Aff: Ziaee & Chen			Neg: Kataria & Li		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Ziaee, Taha	29.5	1	Kataria, Rachit	28.5	2
Chen, Steven	28	3	Li, Sidney	27.5	4

Please circle the team that you intend to vote for. Check here to indicate a low point win is intended Yes

Comments and reason for decision:

Green

Angela, Jorgensen

Room: St. Josephs 309 Start time: 3:00 pm

## SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

## POL Prelim round 1

Instructions: For each speaker enter a Speaker Points score between 1 and 30. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Points. For each speaker enter a Speaker Rank score between 1 and 4. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Rank.

Aff: Atlas & Patou			Neg: Tan & Wang		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
1 Patou, David	28.5	1	2 Wang, Brian	28	2
2 Atlas, Ben	27.9	3	1 Tan, Justin	27	4

Please circle the team that you intend to vote for. Check here to indicate a low point win is intended \_\_\_\_

Comments and reason for decision:

Oral

Desai  
**21, Leland Judge**

Room: St. Clares 4 Start time: 3:00 pm

**SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational**

**POL Prelim round 1**

**Instructions:** For each speaker enter a Speaker Points score between 1 and 30. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Points. For each speaker enter a Speaker Rank score between 1 and 4. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Rank.

Aff: Peng & Xu			Neg: Skyline - Gangaso and Xu		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Peng, Melissa	26	4	Xu, Anna	26.4	2
Xu, Brenda	28	1	Gangaso, Gabe	26.9	3

Please circle the team that you intend to vote for. Check here to indicate a low point win is intended

Comments and reason for decision:

1A  
 - How much trade  
 - what % is through Arctic  
 - How much it will benefit  
 - not details for the  
 - east, time period  
 x did not affect

2A  
 Very effectively stated the  
 Very effective response to  
 cross examination

Disadvantage  
 economic &  
 too much money  
 Didn't show how it  
 will help  
 will take time to  
 build, benefits may  
 b. immediate  
 Spending  
 states  
 if was a general  
 statement not  
 specific to Arctic  
 11/16/2012

Brendan, Vogl

Room: Sobrato 32 Start time: 3:00 pm

ROOM: Library 007

## SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

## POL Prelim round 1

Instructions: For each speaker enter a Speaker Points score between 1 and 30. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Points. For each speaker enter a Speaker Rank score between 1 and 4. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Rank.

Aff: Joshi-Kalra			Neg: Frost-Hanifan		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Kalra, Nikhil	21	4	Hanifan, Tim	24	3
Joshi, Varun	26	2	Frost, Samuel	28	1

Please circle the team that you intend to vote for. Check here to indicate a low point win is intended

Comments and reason for decision:

Aff-  
IA Government needs to fund repairs with the money, they will strengthen infrastructure from the beginning.

2A: plan is throughout US, private sector only wants profit, bidding takes time

\*Negative said there are many hubs besides NY, which is true, and Affirmative stated if NY fails the economy will fail.

\*I voted negative because they said either way the building of infrastructure will take time. The government will run into more delays and the privatized companies are not on a defined budget. Privatizing will also decrease cost.

\*Affirmative did not give any reasons how the government would be faster, they just stated they would be.

file:///C:/Users/Stephen/Documents/CAT/Ballots.html

Neg: plan only focuses on east coast not 50 states. A bidding process between private sectors will be cheaper and more efficient; Fiscal policy, must save money.

\* Infrastructure takes years, it is also expensive, privatizing this will decrease cost, government will run into more delays, private companies are not on defined budget. Aff said 50 billion will be cost for NY and total cost 500 b. total cost.

rebuttal: either way plan will take time, government will not increase infrastructure in not affected areas, government did not have defined plan

Joshi, ~~AJ~~ Vishakha~~Eiserloh, A.J~~

Room: Sobrato 19 Start time: 3:00 pm

## SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

## POL Prelim round 1

Instructions: For each speaker enter a Speaker Points score between 1 and 30. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Points. For each speaker enter a Speaker Rank score between 1 and 4. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Rank.

Aff: DeGiovanni-Schilling			Neg: Fan & Shi		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Schilling, Michelle	25	3	Shi, Mason	26	2
DeGiovanni, Trent	28	1	Fan, Arthur	24	4

Please circle the team that you intend to vote for. Check here to indicate a low point win is intended

Comments and reason for decision:

- didn't vote on cap k → didn't link well to infrastructure and contradicted with centerplan
- there was a lot of debate on exec order but I actually valued the fiscal diff argument more. Neg should have focused on that. Ultimately, I voted on the savings of the money. I didn't think the exec order impacts mattered as much.
- I voted on environ arg as well for aff.
- in general, don't get too caught up on critiques of the actual argument sets & dismissed (that's where I ended up voting).

Soto, Edward

Paulette, Wachter

Room: St. Josephs 109 Start time: 3:00 pm

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL Prelim round 1

Instructions: For each speaker enter a Speaker Points score between 1 and 30. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Points. For each speaker enter a Speaker Rank score between 1 and 4. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Rank.

Aff: Guilford & Nguyen			Neg: Tso & Zhao		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Guilford, Alec	<del>26</del> 26	<del>3</del> 3	Tso, Dustin	<del>25</del> 25	<del>4</del> 4
Nguyen, Brian	28	<del>2</del> 2	Zhao, Wilson	28	<del>1</del> 1

Please circle the team that you intend to vote for. Check here to indicate a low point win is intended \_\_\_\_\_

Comments and reason for decision:

- A, G
- struggled
  - spoke in unclear manner
  - used lots of evidence
  - Highway trust fund was emphasized
  - critical link to trade
  - moving goods/people helps steady economy
  - Better spoken
  - lacked to show evidence in cross
  - trade → import & export  
     No            Yes
  - deduct trade deficit thru highways not overseas
  - oil dependency
  - compromise now
  - set to expire 2014
  - invest in manufacturing
  - global warming

- N, W - nicely done
- no fairness in education / not allowing reaction
  - regional power
  - only occurs after 2014
  - global extinction of species
  - oil dependency still stands
  - Very good cross
  - Great speaker, very clear
  - unpopular tax
  - no legit evidence
  - employment steady since 08 (repetition)
  - not definite; just inflation
  - China still biggest investor
  - emphasized
  - no evidence
  - no fix rate
  - Dist had weak arguments
  - Great cross exam almost completely ~~had~~ stumped opponent

We need highways to travel from place to place and if there is no other way to support them other than the highway trust fund then how can we maintain them. Construction for highways is not a permanent solution for jobs, but were trying to steady our economy within the U.S. not within China's manufacturing industry. Highways are important for trade and for people to travel.

*Newark, Todd*  
**Gray, Robin**

Room: St. Clares 1 Start time: 3:00 pm

**SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational**

**POL Prelim round 1**

**Instructions:** For each speaker enter a Speaker Points score between 1 and 30. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Points. For each speaker enter a Speaker Rank score between 1 and 4. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Rank.

Aff: Irving-Thomas & Marquez			Neg: Cai & Wang		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Irving-Thomas, Lenard	28.5	1	Wang, Hanson	27.5	3
Marquez, Chris	28	2	Cai, Bill	28	4

Please circle the team that you intend to vote for. Check here to indicate a low point win is intended \_\_\_\_\_

Comments and reason for decision:

3:30

~~6:32~~

~~3:03~~

2:46

Andrey

**McNulty, Brian**

Room: St. Clares 6 Start time: 3:00 pm

**SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational****POL Prelim round 1**

**Instructions:** For each speaker enter a Speaker Points score between 1 and 30. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Points. For each speaker enter a Speaker Rank score between 1 and 4. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Rank.

Aff: Auro & Hampton-Bruce			Neg: Adduri & Bharadwaj		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Auro, Jason	20	2	Adduri, Abhinav	20	3
Hampton-Bruce, William	12	4	Bharadwaj, Tejas	14	1

Please circle the team that you intend to vote for. Check here to indicate a low point win is intended

Comments and reason for decision:

1st aff read his speech so fast it was not understandable.  
 2nd aff made a good recovery  
 aff did not make toxicity point

Vasquez, Mark

Velamuri, Madhu

Room: St. Clares 2 Start time: 3:00 pm

## SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

## POL Prelim round 1

Instructions: For each speaker enter a Speaker Points score between 1 and 30. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Points. For each speaker enter a Speaker Rank score between 1 and 4. Do not enter duplicate scores for Speaker Rank.

Aff: Chatterjee & Merchant			Neg: Turner & Moore		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Merchant, Riyaz	29	1	Moore, Zakiya	25	4
Chatterjee, Kushal	29	2	Turner, Shah	26	3

Please circle the team that you intend to vote for. Check here to indicate a low point win is intended

Comments and reason for decision:

Neg needs to work on organization and staging focused in round. D/As appear and disappear seemingly at random and are moved from on case to off case between speeches.

Neg needs to be more familiar with their own evidence and args, work on making responsive arguments

Urban sprawl: No ②, Aff solves for impacts, o/w by case

Airlines: No ②, plan solves, o/w by case, lack of evidence

②: Perm solves, Neg offers no evidence that perm does not work. Neg offers no link between bridges and capitalism. No neg response to Aff framework so I weigh case against ②. Case o/w. No response to Aff argument that perm solves ② better. Neg never responds to conditions bad.

Case: No neg arguments on case. All advs flow through the end of the round, when I can weigh case against ② under Aff framework, unmitigated case seriously o/ws any articulated impacts on the ②. Even still, the perm gets the unmitigated adv and at a minimum a risk of ③ for ②.

Aff wins