

NOVICE AND

OPEN POLICY

Ademi Ashok

Brendan Vogl

Room: St. Clares 4 Start time: 5:01 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL 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: Chatterjee & Merchant			Neg: Irving-Thomas & Marquez		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Merchant, Riyaz ¹	30	1	Irving-Thomas, Lenard ¹	28	3
Chatterjee, Kushal ¹	27	4	Marquez, Chris ²	29	2

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:

The policy debate is a topical debate, and as a judge, I up front outlined I would vote on stock issues, and in the light since they did not address any of the stock issues the Aff wins the debate.

Mary said that the debate was moved into a discussion of racism. I agree completely with ~~that~~ ^{racism is bad}, and I agree this is a problem to be solved. However, implementing "transportation solutions" is orthogonal to this. Spending investment for infrastructure will not result in a solution to the problem raised. ^(so agree with Aff here as well)

The debate was extremely interesting even in it changed direction - Great speakers, great arguments, great work from both teams.

Andrey, Doug

Room:Kennedy 108 Start time:5:01 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL 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: Turner & Moore			Neg: Kataria & Li		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Moore, Zakiya	22	4	Kataria, Rachit	25	3
Turner, Shah	28	1	Li, Sidney	26	2

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:

NEGATIVE TEAM HAD REASONABLE COUNTER EVIDENCE BUT THEIR HYPERBOLIC ~~CLAIMS~~ HURT THEIR CREDIBILITY

AFFIRMATIVE TEAM NEEDS TO FLESH OUT AS FAR AS AGENT, THEY WOULD HAVE LOST WITHOUT APPROPRIATIONS BILL SHOULD IN BEEN IN AC SPEECHES, VERY NARROW WIN. WEAK CLOSING SPEECH FOR AFF.

Merchant
Desai, Paramesh

Room: St. Clares 3 Start time: 5:01 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL 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: Frost-Hanifan			Neg: Wang & Pelcastre		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Hanifan, Tim	28	2	Wang, Michael	30	1
Frost, Samuel	27	3	Pelcastre, Jose	25	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:

Aff's plan hinged on improving the economy by increasing transportation access, reducing operating costs & reducing global warming & oil dependence.

Neg raised the Cliff & healthcare DA's. Their argument on healthcare was not well defended. On the Cliff DA, their key point was that we cannot afford to spend any more money & that doing so would ruin trust, politically.

Aff countered that spending was would force compromise, an argument that did not appear logical.

While spending was not popular, given the cliff, infrastructure spending is an investment. Neg did not adequately defend against the payback & stimulus. Neg also did not adequately rebut the use of clean coal, etc.

Capara, ColinRoom: ~~St. Clare 5~~ Start time: 5:01 PM

Arts (28)

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational**POL 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: DeGiovanni-Schilling			Neg: Tan & Wang		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Schilling, Michelle	27	4	Wang, Brian	27	3
DeGiovanni, Trent	28	1	Tan, Justin	27	2

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

Green, Perry

Room: St. Clares 2 Start time: 5:01 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational**POL 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: Joshi-Kalra			Neg: Guilford & Nguyen		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
1 Kalra, Nikhil	27.8	3	1 Guilford, Alec	28.5	
2 Joshi, Varun	27.9	4	1 Nguyen, Brian	28	2

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 - Disadvantage ~~plans~~ o/w case's Rail fund/transparent
 is destroyed by the plan - this causes an issue of politics
 Comments email me: perry@andl.org
 Questions

Mileo, Paul
 Room: Casa 7 Start time: 5:01 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational
POL 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.

5:48

Aff: Chen & Boreckzy			Neg: Atlas & Patou		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
1 Chen, Tommie	24	4	2 Patou, David	28	1
2 Boreckzy, Chance	25	3	1 Atlas, Ben	27	2

2:17
~~8:58~~
 4:17

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 vote Neg on the (T) on substrand. The Neg did a great job explaining how this affects the round and how their arguments work in the language of the Resolution. I was very pleased with the Negs explanation of (T). In Addition to (T) the case itself has many flaws which the Neg pointed out in the Aff's own evidence. I wasn't persuaded by cybersecurity, and was happy it was kicked, or coercion which wasn't explained very well on either side. There also wasn't much good clash on the Boreckzy D/A. I think there were times when the Neg went for too much but they don't let their big them down in the long run. However some Aff teams would take advantage of a Neg spread them.

Paul H. Mileo

Vogel

Smith, Ennis

Room: Kennedy 109 Start time: 5:01 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL 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: Fan & Shi			Neg: Tuggle-Whitemore		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Shi, Mason	28	3	Tuggle, Emily	27.3	4
Fan, Arthur	29	1	Whitemore, Cooper	28.2	2

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:

1. aff rebuttal:

- ~~affirmative~~
- moral issues associated with famine are more important than death
- maintaining locks & dams do not increase
- drug trafficking happens everywhere
- will not build more facilities
- prevent soy beans, will help with deforestation

2. Stops dams from future collapse

1. neg rebuttal:

- coal disadvantage: modernizing inland water ways will increase ships
- Drug trafficking: between Mexican and U.S. borders more ships, more drug trafficking,
- maintenance: increase infrastructure is not maintenance, does not link to resolution

2. Railways ~~work~~ work just as well as water ways: can ~~prevent~~ prevent famine just as much

on back

I felt the affirmative plan showed how modernization of the inner water way systems would help. The negative ~~is~~ lacked in proving the affirmative wrong. Increasing investment would not lead to famine, it would keep food prices down, diminish deforestation, boost the economy, as well as help provide relief with natural disasters. The negative said cattle is the main cause of

Aff Neg
 4:37 7:05
 1:30 3:46

Vasquez, Mick

Room: St. Clares 6 Start time: 5:01 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL 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: A & A			Neg: Shangguan & Park		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Contreas-Ramazzini, Hector	26	4	Park, Daniel	28	2
Garcia, Diego	29	1	Shangguan, Henry	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:

Aff goes all in on cond. knowledge but fails to address key framework arguments from the negative about evaluating the @ before cond. knowledge. Additionally, more time needs to be spent addressing the line by line and not just grouping all of conditionality back into two broad voters.

Neg wins

1AR + 2AR debate
the K as though it's a DA

Phillips, Les

Room: St. Josephs 309 Start time: 5:01 PM

TRY TO FLASH MORE EFFICIENTLY...

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

FOR THE KVAAL!!

POL 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: Cai & Wang			Neg: Skyline - Gangaso and Xu		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Wang, Hanson	24	4	Xu, Anna	28	1
Cai, Bill	24	3	Gangaso, Gabe	25	2

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 refuses to give IAC to neg. until after CX? A bit rude... IA has real trouble answering CX questions. IA seems to think neg should answer their own questions about his case.

Then aff wants to see INC before it has been given.

2A has 1 response on K, only a couple on the DA announces that neg dropped their e con adv. (they didn't). Generally on case 2A "extends" his cards, reads more cards, ignores what NEG said, including the environment terms.

2A's explanation of the PERM doesn't make much sense, I'm afraid.

2N reads good cards but should relate them to 2AC responses. INC is kind of late for framework, but whatever.

Case flow(s) throughout the round are an absolute mess. 1AR has some good answers & extensions but is hard to follow. 1AR is entirely screaming new on the K.

2NR is not too articulate on the K, though he wins it; doesn't do a good job explaining why it swamps the case. DA risk > case, though 2NR is sketchy as case for d. 11/16/2012

McNulty
Advani, Ashok

Room:Sobrato 32 Start time:5:01 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL 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: Marquez & Irving-Thomas			Neg: Peng & Xu		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Irving-Thomas, Lenard			Peng, Melissa		
Marquez, Chris			Xu, Brenda		

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:

No Show

Omohundro-McNulty, Amy

Room: St. Josephs 109 Start time: 5:01 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL 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: Patil & Raghuram			Neg: Ziaee & Chen		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Patil, Gauri			Ziaee, Taha		
Raghuram, Sonia			Chen, Steven		

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 didn't show

Amy J. McNulty

Newkirk, Todd

Room: St. Clares 1 Start time: 5:01 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL 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: Tso & Zhao			Neg: Gangoso & Xu		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Tso, Dustin			Xu, Anna		
Zhao, Wilson			Gangoso, Gabe		

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:

No
Show
on neg

Suresh, Adduri

Room:Sobrato 19 Start time:5:01 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational**POL 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: Auro & Hampton-Bruce			Neg: Gollapalli & Wang		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Auro, Jason			Wang, Conover		
Hampton-Bruce, William			Gollapalli, Pavan		

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:

NEGATIVE TEAM Did NOT Show UP UNTIL 6:15 PM

Step
Velamuri, Madhu

Room: Casa 8 Start time: 5:01 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL 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: Adduri & Bharadwaj			Neg: Siddiqui & Garg		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Adduri, Abhinav	30		Garg, Aditya		
Bharadwaj, Tejas	30		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:

No show