

NOVICE AND

OPEN POLICY

Capara, Colin

Room:Kenna 218 Start time:12:34 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational**POL Prelim round 5**

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: Wang & Pelcastre			Neg: Joshi-Kalra		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Wang, Michael	26	4	Kalra, Nikhil	27	2
Pelcastre, Jose	26	3	Joshi, Varun	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:

no offense on cp means it solves 100% case w/
10% chance to solve HR net benefit.

Kunes, Kevin

Room: Arts 246 Start time: 12:34 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL Prelim round 5

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: Chen & Boreckzy		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Peng, Melissa	29	1	Chen, Tommie	19	4
Xu, Brenda	24	3	Boreckzy, Chance	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:

Melissa

Surprisingly clear given the WPM. Defended links well in 1st CX despite tricky questioning. attacked Foot is but" ridge in a better manner. Defended Foot K very well. Deep of a counter part was significant and it was very up. A little down in oral debate but overall nearly. CP links were better question, but not specifically rebuttal or rebuttal. Would've liked for her to make specified attack. Many rebuttals were unclear.

Brenda

Did not need to speak. Had plenty of time left and repetition is not clarity. attack of CP was awkward, try to focus on negatives specifically about reforming the system. good answers to examination if not very confident. Had a point in criticizing second rebuttals of Neg were not "responsive" an Alt for the K was giving, a K response was not convincing. A little confidence would go a long way. You definitely have the skill to rock Public Forum or Lincoln Douglas. That would help with Policy confidence.

Chance

Short A priori "Risk" argument. were guilty of a few unlikely links themselves (though not all). Nothing too bad. try to do most of the talking in your examination. Very repetitive evidence, accidently allowed him to go over time. Insisted during rebuttals that link chains were important, but did not prove this original citation of K made it constructive did hold-up (despite the lack of evidence in rebuttal).

Tommie

Speaking is always a good thing, your WPM wasn't really high while still being non-understandable at times during K and CP portions of constructive. Try to have whole speech sound like the on case portion. Made an effective defense to counterplans and attacked links specifically. Rebuttal was dismissive in an unconvincing way. CP and 2nd negs were certainly NOT dropped. not much of a response to attack on that points (despite definitely having the necessary card). Big speaker point deduction due to eye rolls, repetition CX and interruption of speeches. Either learn to whisper quietly or don't.

Rubner
Amreen
Nowkirk, Todd

Room: St. Josephs 309 Start time: 12:34 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL Prelim round 5

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: Auro & Hampton-Bruce		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Patou, David	29	2	Auro, Jason	29	1
Atlas, Ben	29	4	Hampton-Bruce, William	30	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:

oral

Turner, Ashlyn

~~Mabie, Ben~~

Room: Kenna 104 Start time: 12:34 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL Prelim round 5

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: A & A		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
2A Tuggle, Emily	28	2	Contreas-Ramazzini, Hector IN	27	4
1A Whitemore, Cooper	27.5	3	Garcia, Diego AN	28.5	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:

The IAR dropping case and not explaining the perm are problems for the aff in this debate. Even if I buy that the perm was extended not extending/explaining the case (specifically how you resolve ~~is a problem also~~ your impacts and B impacts) try to read ~~as~~ a link turn and no impact args (or no link and impact turns) ^{will help} more than cap good alone. More explanation from the negative as to why it solves the case would do well. I vote on the impact of the B (capitalism being an engine of war, specifically citing ^{the} Vietnam war).

Schletzbaum, Charles

Room: Kenna 212 Start time: 12:34 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL Prelim round 5

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: Tan & Wang			Neg: Fan & Shi		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
3 Wang, Brian	22	2	Shi, Mason	22	1
1 Tan, Justin	26	4	Fan, Arthur	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:

Justin - blew through things - so Canada isn't foreign oil ~~oil~~
 @h - ? talk about that? Did we Annex Canada?

Arthur - was CPJ. you can pipeline, not trans them
 in politics DA you - cards say congressional transportation
 negotiators refuse to include KXC in negotiations - implying
 that it is transportation committee

Brian you never said switch pages so I ended up flawed
 oil on cap & poli on oil. **SUPPORT better**

Mason - too much time wasted on fairness Arg's. Try @ jurisdiction :
 ITS less whiney. Now. Why I don't like (K)... to force you
 "we don't have to solve for Aff just cap." I rest my case

Wow Poli + CP + cap all contradicted (XO is gov which you say is part of
 Cap System)

condo winning about if the suck is a wee bit hypocritical, ya think?
 case - started by aff... seriously?

cap - still weak, and dropped by ARF
 Topicality Barely Neg. weak and whiny voters but pointed

in favor of Condo reverse vote -
 oil pointed by both ~~CP~~ - pointed was ~~top~~ semi topical anyway if got
 politics pointed by both ~~win +~~ putting everything for Condo... and was
 silly since voters want in
 constructions

Eisen (OP), A.J. (Marker)

Flores, Joseph

Room: Kenna 306 Start time: 12:34 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL Prelim round 5

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: Adduri & Bharadwaj		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Irving-Thomas, Lenard	23	4	Adduri, Abhinav	28	2
Marquez, Chris	24	3	Bharadwaj, Tejas	29	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
 there's racial oppression in urban transportation areas?
 1st speaker raps about own personal experiences about racism + racial oppression

there's violence in transportation
 investing time + money

wants to revolutionize policy making

evidence → own personal narratives + experiences

- speaking to minorities as a whole

"U.S. First country to be racist" → where's the evidence?

- will not solve for racism
 it will educate judge

"who best educates the public of the oppressed?"

where is the connection between U.S. transportation infrastructure and racial oppression?
 + eurocentrism

Are you sure that the majority of the U.S. is Caucasian? You didn't give a source

Policy is not the right medium for your style of speech + debate / performance

Your performance was great, and I understood your goal; however, please stick to the topic/resolution

NEG where is the transportation infrastructure?

Tejas - blue shirt
 Abhinav - Purple shirt

opponent is narrow minded
 contemporary narratives try to provide progression
 opponent is raising awareness of problem

policy needs to not be ignored in this debate

where's the policy?

needs to start framing solutions

- They are not affirming the resolution

- You did a great job debating when the opposing side debates about something totally different than what you prepped for

Paton, Emily

Room: Kenna 216 Start time: 12:34 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL Prelim round 5

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: Skyline - Gangaso and Xu			Neg: Frost-Hanifan		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Xu, Anna	28	1	Hanifan, Tim	27.8	3
Gangaso, Gabe	27.7	4	Frost, Samuel	27.8	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:

GREAT SPEAKERS!

1A - Gabe

- Way to get all those arguments in there.
- Let Tim answer all questions in cross-X. You were a little hostile.
- Funding for plan a bit convoluted. make more clear.
- work on spreading.

2A - Anna

- good response to T.
- nice answers in cross-X.
- You're awesome at spreading. Way to address all of neg's points from INC.
- Nice job weighing impacts

1N - Tim

- good questions brought up in cross-X.
- Good T. Definition was a little bit stretched.
- Good CP - nice warrants.

2N - Sam

- good job responding to Aff's climate change and econ advantages.
- good job with explaining how nexgen doesn't solve for Aff's impact.

I was impressed with how respectful you all were towards one another. Everyone here was a great debater. I like how neg talks about value to life. More real-life issues. Neg also did a good job keeping access to their CP, despite aff's attempts to take it away. I buy that you can't perm CP, neg argued for this well. Both teams did a good job regaining access to impacts ~~at the end of the speeches~~ in each speech after other team refuted evidence. I'd like to see both teams run more offense on the other. When evidence is constantly being repeated it's harder to judge the debate. Impact turns are great, go for those. 2A/2 was really good. You regained access to your nuke war scenario. Even though neg's T argument was legit, they had many excellent arguments against aff so this debate was not judged on T. Because aff regained access to their impacts at the end,

Porges, Ellie

Room:Kenna 102 Start time:12:34 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational**POL Prelim round 5**

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: Chatterjee & Merchant		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Ziaee, Taha	27.5	1	Merchant, Riyaz	26.9	3
Chen, Steven	27	2	Chatterjee, Kushal	26.5	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:

The affirmative attempted to argue that the Panama Canal will increase US trade markets because it will allow for the passage of large ships. They stated that Obama has expedited money into ports but hasn't actually distributed the funds. Competitiveness was argued in such a way that is needed for the expansion of global, national and local markets as well as being beneficial to the environment. It wouldn't increase spending but it would increase investment. There is a double bid and the neg toward solvency and created a double bind for the ego argument. The aff didn't have signals and the neg proved the fed program was inefficient and broken.

Flores

Desai, Paramesh

Room: St. Josephs 109 Start time: 12:34 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational**POL Prelim round 5**

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: DeGiovanni-Schilling		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Park, Daniel	29	2	Schilling, Michelle	28	3
Shangguan, Henry	29	1	DeGiovanni, Trent	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:

MOST SPEAKERS JUMP AROUND ALL OVER THE PLACE - A VERY HARD ROUND

FEAR THE KVAACI

INR ORATES, DROPS MOST OF THE 14 2AC AREAS ON

Phillips, Les

Room: Daly 106 Start time: 12:34 PM

BOTH NEG SPEAKERS VERY REPETITIVE AFTER INC

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL Prelim round 5

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: Kataria & Li			Neg: Tso & Zhao		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Kataria, Rachit	24.5	2	Tso, Dustin	22.2	3
Li, Sidney	24.7	1	Zhao, Wilson	22	4

framework, COMPLAINS THAT AFF DOESN'T CASH!

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 don't have a car either, and I'd certainly like one but I don't regard my self as a victim of structural violence much less genocide. I am often happy to vote for efforts of this type, but I'm afraid this IAC is not very compelling.

Much of INC framework is unwanted, in 2NC - really NOT GOOD, EVER.

Why does IAR abandon 2AC structure on full?

much of the rest of 2NC is a scattering of policy buzzwords. BUILD UNWANTED ARGUMENTS.

Throughout the round the neg. speaks as though they are real and aff is unreal. Their vision of debate is useful and the neg's vision is "wordless" or that aff is breaking the [mythical] rules. Unwanted for these a priori judgments are shallow at best.

which is unwanted the neg never undermines

IAR debates as though 2AC hadn't happened - why? Good explanation of DISCUSSION.

RFD: Neg wins that aff. doesn't debate the way they want than to. Aff. wins their own framework

Andrale

Peng, Grand

Room:Kenna 109 Start time:12:34 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL Prelim round 5

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: Gullford & Nguyen			Neg: Turner & Moore		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Gullford, Alec	20	1	Moore, Zakiya	20	4
Nguyen, Brian	21	3	Turner, Shah	23	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 turns the framework of neg and is not handled by the neg. Neg concedes mpx/ (S) Aff & no articulation of how Alt. (S) (K) & Aff.

Vote on risk of aff.