

NOVICE AND

OPEN POLICY

Scheer

Sheer, Chris

Room: Loyola 134 Start time: 5:01 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

PLN Prelim round 2

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.

left

Aff: Bhat & Mamtara			Neg: Pakala & Wang		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Bhat, Pratik	27.5	2	Pakala, Suraj	27	3
Mamtora, Aditya	27.5	1	Wang, Eric	26	4

left

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

TFIA

Say date of ev. when you read it

Be careful w/ numbers

Decision

Perm work goes unchallenged

Very polite, generous with 6th graders.

Neg

Eric - ask coach about "line by line refutation"

Ask each coach about what Fiat is & Perm

Careful of CX

traps: They asked what exact disease would kill everybody and you tried to name it -> you should have just said it we don't know (because we don't!)

Brave to do this in 6th grade! Good job!

**Schletzbaum, Charles**

Room: OConnor 215 Start time: 5:01 PM

**SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational**

**PLN Prelim round 2**

**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.

used 52

used 52

Aff: Periyakoil & Rajput			Neg: Kelbert & Desai		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Periyakoil, Divya	28	2	Desai, Prashant	28	3
Rajput, Sanil	28	1	Kelbert, James	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:

Divya - 50 point case more 2025 a little far off... is that enough time for climate

Prashant - 270 left; not actually read impacts to DA little more in ex. Road map in INR please

Sanil - jumped around... Flow has big gap

James - Rambled & repeated for 2 min. read a non competitive topical CP. 1. read another DA still

James - work on breathing - oxygen level me INR more than a monologue

CP - only half formed even though Divya hit's hard and Prashant was good. Aff should have permitted CP.

Attacks on case are distorted and only stick on Solency or economy. Aff is still wanting to reduce CO2 even a little. Time frame is sketchy but no proof would work since no real impact to standing DA

Spending DA - Never any impact except trade off with health care which I must weigh against some weight of extraction.

Porges, Ellie

Room:Loyola 136 Start time:5:01 PM

## SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

## PLN Prelim round 2

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: MSJ - Lee and Shao			Neg: Kuppahally & Bhoja		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Shao, William	26.5	3	Kuppahally, Anusha	26.9	2
Lee, Clifford	27.1	1	Bhoja, Arushee	26.3	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: I voted for the Affirmative because they showed a greater understanding of their points and the topic. Their impact far outweighed those presented by the neg. The Affirmative addressed those arguments brought forth by the neg.

**Alamzai, Mujda**

Room: Loyola 132 Start time: 5:01 PM

**SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational****PLN Prelim round 2**

**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: Varma & Varma			Neg: Jain & Huynh		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Varma, Gaurav	29	1	Huynh, Megan	25	4
Varma, Anuj	28	2	Jain, Anika	27	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:

Gaurav: oh my God, thank you for being so organized I really appreciate it!

Anika: You need to watch your attitude in round. You seem disinterested and a little rude. That won't fly with most lay judges, which is more likely at this tournament and on California circuits.

Anuj: good, clear 2AC. Your roadmap was a little confusing but following your speech was pretty easy.

Megan: You can't be so dependent on your partner during cross-ex. You also need to maximize the amount of ground you can gain by using all of your cross-ex.

PS. I LOVE ANALOGIES!!

You really need to get more familiar with your arguments. You are too dependent on your partner.

RED: Aff clearly extends perm throughout the entire round and totally takes out the Neg's political capital argument. Fiscal cliff had no discernable impact until the NR. Water tradeoff was not specific enough so did not extend. Water trade-off was only comparable impact and failed under affirmative responses.

Paton, Emily

Room:Loyola 137 Start time:5:01 PM

## SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

## PLN Prelim round 2

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: Huang & Zhou			Neg: MSJ - Dayal and Jinjuwadia		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Zhou, Annie	27.5	2	Jinjuwadia, Jay	26.5	4
Huang, Kaylan	28	1	Dayal, rahul	27	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 - Kaylan

- Nice evidence, good pace.
- need more clear links to econ collapse.
- how does global warming lead to extinction?

2A - Annie

- Good job talking about credibility of sources.
- good job extending evidence
- IN didn't respond to
- You repeated a lot of the things your partner said.
- Try to use other techniques to refute neg's arguments like "turn" or "non-unique."

1N - Jay

- work on being more clear with evidence.
- Try to link to bigger impacts.
- Be clear with what arguments of Aff you are responding to.
- No new evidence in rebuttals!

2N - Rahul

- jumped from climate change, to econ, then back to climate change
- Good job bringing up time frame!
- work on flow.
- Weigh net benefits, talk about impacts in final speech!.

The affirmative team did a good job linking plan to impacts. While the negative team tried to refute the point that plan avoids double dip recession and slows global warming, they were not able to turn any of their links and they were able to extend their link to Global Warming because neg did not respond to it. Both teams need to do a better job weighing net benefits in the rebuttal speeches instead of repeating your evidence.

Soto, Edward

Room: Loyola 138 Start time: 5:01 PM

## SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

## PLN Prelim round 2

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: Kim & Young			Neg: Zheng & Ziaee		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Kim, Minki	24	3	Ziaee, Sameer	<del>29</del> 29	2
Young, Richard	22	4	Zheng, Margaret	30	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<sub>1</sub> M - good flow

- economy must expand to ↓ employment
- unreliable info (Middle east)
- 600,000 jobs
- oil dependence will lower
- double debt recession

N<sub>1</sub> S

- hard to understand at first
- Excellent evidence
- 10<sup>th</sup> amendment
- dollar down = ↑ interest
- won't boost employment
- Federal spending structure is horrible
- wasteful & harmful to environment

A<sub>2</sub> R - struggled to speak

- jobs = boost economy
- Amtrak in demand
- Air flight has fallen 1.5%
- loans will be repayed by taxpayers

N<sub>2</sub> M

- knew exactly what she was talking about
- prepared/good knowledge
- Excellent cross
- Oil comes from Canada 51%
- US 38%
- Saudi Arabia is not an international dependency
- ~~27~~ 27 yrs + ? of geothermal = ???
- no idea of how long geothermal will take
- 1 employee or 50 employees
- States don't have \$16 trillion debt

Neg had further control and actually had a plan for the HSR and knew actual location. Aff had no idea of where it would be, had to create geothermal energy first and then wait an additional 27 yrs for the completion of the HSR.

Sarchet

integral  
found

\* Cross - yes or no

Gao, Guilian

Room: Parlor B Start time: 5:01 PM

For acronyms, make sure to state meanings explicitly

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

\* practice rebuttals - smoothness

PLN Prelim round 2

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: Singh & Warsi			Neg: Advani & Suwala		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Singh, Chandanjeet	27.9	1	Advani, Ira	27.1	3
Warsi, Rafay	27.8	2	Suwala, Maia	26.4	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:

- 1A: Based on coal transports, support economic growth, good, rebut evidence, topic a little unclear at beginning since only talking about coal. Think that there should be more concentration on the topic. Who is the agent? enforcer? fundings? keep up status quo, be wary of going off topic, solve global warming
- CE: 1A vague in cost, does not answer Q, cross-examiner needs to not let him talk as much
- 1N: \$23b, past funding + planned funding, should address contentious 1 by 1. Don't need jobs, non-infrastructure problems, proposes marine transportation, saying that it actually hurts the environments, cost of plan (\$148b), what about inland transportation? No counterplan
- CE: good pointing out 2007 into relevance now, using own evidence against them
- 2A: no matter the cost, enough of a return on investment, No concession to coal, refutation to marine? importance of coal; key provider of jobs, costs less than crude oil. No counterplan timelike error
- CE: plan proposal: no cost, need ~~specific~~ specific evidence regarding timelike + funding, CS, good point
- 2N: points out lack of evidence, technology for aff/plan? timetable, not a long term solution, jobs in coal industry declining, ethanol?
- CE: cross examinations getting messy
- 1NR: World already shifting to clean energy, already have global warming solutions. All evidence? CCS? talking about freight, not CCS, money will send us back into a recession, damages ozone
- 1AR: economy is not really "good", says partner addressed evidence issue, plan will help save the economy, railroads is outgoing, stimulus concession to early deaths, clean coal
- 2NR: lack of evidence, jobs produced will be low paying
- 2AR: dropped disadvantage, did not really rebut pollutants, good pointing out new point, good job of saying why should vote for aff

The affirmative side made coherent and logical arguments, but the negative side pointed out key lacks of evidence. That being said, the aff team did a better job of showing the benefits of their plan, so I vote for aff.

**Kunes, Kevin**

Room: Benson 15 Start time: 5:01 PM

**SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational**

**PLN Prelim round 2**

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: Singh & Tuharsky			Neg: Gulati & Huang		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Singh, Ameet	27	2	Gulati/Shubhangi	23	4
Tuharsky, Alex	25	3	Huang, Michelle	27	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:

**Alex**  
 Takes a long time to clear in 1st round. Included links roughly in CX. (Not a link). Clues jump Os in CX. Should be more. Adding some of the 2 minutes. Quoted "I want to study the economy". Interest's position especially when backing the private sector. Partner explained and even let permission to help case.

**Ameet**  
 Presentation concise and overfull. Taxation was clear as well. EU bailout not after the 1st capital transfer. Confusion and almost too slow in argument. Failed to define debt to a state. "SR service". Base point very weakly created. Made good use of 2nd round evidence. Caught "interest rate" report trap. Not too happy about new "theoretical" "credit" example in 1st speech and a

**Shubhangi**  
 Speculation that the arguments were good but needed evidence or quotes to back up logic. Counter plan was solid but couldn't use historical examples of public companies being better. Ran Fed future was more frequent than Fed's future. 1st rebuttal was more detailed and useful. Still did not respond to interest rates of Federal versus private sector.

**Michelle**  
 Budgetary CX time very well. Same trap as Govt B. Spots creation, used to make better facts = failed plans paid in 1st round. Her facts the Aff's 2nd C. are not but she takes use of them. Failed to absorb inputs, but did not give a reason why public sector is good. Only that the Federal is bad (despite Aff's counter). "5 examples" we said, but there was unrelated points (not Aff) counter and examples in 1st speech. Govt B did not say explicitly argument in 1st speech. Govt B did speak in presentation plan.

topic: U.S. govt should substantially invest in transportation infrastructure

Eiserloh, A.J

Room: Benson 21 Start time: 5:01 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

PLN Prelim round 2

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: Baluyot & Nguyen			Neg: Nouri & Elahi		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Nguyen, Richard	27	2	Nouri, Melody	3	21
Baluyot, Darrin	28	1	Elahi, Samar	4	20

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

NEG

US should privatize port sector  
privatize transit

8 min each  
3 min each

deepening ports  
& dredgers  
get silt out of ports  
to make ports larger  
- need to get ready for Panama Canal  
delays in funding  
biggest problem (2014)  
more jobs  
global warming  
in + out faster  
less emissions

1) attacks port dredging  
already happening / cost 5 billion dollars more

2) ~~help small businesses~~ future maintenance costs  
~~with most small businesses~~  
private sector is solution

3) not environmentally friendly  
why? - contaminants  
- water circulation patterns

• why this plan doesn't actually hurt small businesses?  
small businesses send products to other countries as well

Samar - trouble giving smoothly without sounding like your reading from your script

1st speaker - Darrin  
↳ very good! very strong speaker

Richard - ~~only~~ slip ups in delivery but other than that, good job

- dealt with the cross-ex very well

\* wasn't on track until halfway through

\* Port Security had nothing to do with port dredging

~~Read wrong piece of evidence 1st~~

\* Read wrong piece of evidence 1st

\* I didn't know what HSR was until your opponents said what it was