

NOVICE AND

OPEN POLICY

Omohundro-McNulty, Amy

Room:Kenna 306 Start time:4:00 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational**POL Prelim round 6**

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: Chen & Boreckzy			Neg: Shangguan & Park		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Chen, Tommie ^{1A}	28	4	Park, Daniel ^{2B}	29	1
Boreckzy, Chance ^{1A}	28	3	Shangguan, Henry ^{1A}	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:

Keitik has more REAL political solvency
through individual action

Amy J. McNulty

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational
POL Prelim round 6
START TIME:

JUDGENAME1	AFF	NEG	ROOMNAME
Bye	JamLog WP	N/A	
Mileo, Paul	BU AA	Lynbro KL	Daly 106
McNulty, Brian	Leland FS	DiaVal ZC	Kenna 102
Omohundro-McNulty, Amy	JamLog CB	Lynbro SP	Kenna 306
Schletzbaum, Charles	MSJ TZ	BU GX	Kenna 104
Phillips, Les	Dougl S D	BU IM	Arts 246
Kunes, Kevin	BU TM	JamLog TW	Kenna 216
Capara, Colin	MSJ CM	JamLog GN	St. Josephs 309
Green, Perry	Dougl FH	MSJ CW	Kenna 212
Scheer, Chris	Leland KJ	Dougl TW	Kenna 109
Andrade, Nancy	CalPre AH	MSJ PX	Kenna 218
Flores, Joseph	MSJ AB	Gunn AP	St. Josephs 109

McNulty, Brian

Room:Kenna 102 Start time:4:00 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL Prelim round 6

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: Ziaee & Chen		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Shi, Mason	26	2	Ziaee, Taha	26	3
Fan, Arthur	26	1	Chen, Steven	26	4

Small
1
2

moderate
A-act!

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: 5:40 left 3:50 vote

Aff impacts intact and outweigh
Neg DA.

Phillips
Andrade, Nancy
Room: Kenna 218 Start time: 4:00 PM

FEAR THE KVAALITY
SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational
POL Prelim round 6

MOST OF CARDS
VIOLATIONS
IN 2NC => REALLY
GROSS

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.

146

329

Aff: Auro & Hampton-Bruce			Neg: Peng & Xu		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Auro, Jason	28	1	Peng, Melissa	2	3
Hampton-Bruce, William	22	2	Xu, Brenda	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:

Aff really needs a coherent explanation of whiteness under CX.

Neg framework is ultimately circular; says policy framework is good because it promotes political framework thinking. aff is not predictable b/c neg expected to argue policy, etc. Angs depend on unwarranted opinion.
Neg has an absolute obligation to indicate parts of cards they didn't read.

T in 2NC - except first violation is in 1st round
On T violations: this round especially needs better articulation of voters that simply chanting "fairness by education"
INR appears to accuse an African-American debater of endorsing white supremacy.
(This is an entirely new DA in INR.)

Neg never contests that they dipped cards. In 2NC they claim that the practice does not injure their opponents; ~~aff~~ aff. says they did not that's not the point; it's an absolute ethical issue. Aff. could be more precisely eloquent on the voter, but when neg admits that what they gave the aff. is not

what debater
"what debater
national
the charge of excluding the
and don't defend themselves
against
what they
noted

Anelrade

~~Green, Perry~~

Room:Kenna 212 Start time:4:00 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL Prelim round 6

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: Cai & Wang		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
ZAC Hanifan, Tim	25 25	1	Wang, Hanson	23 23	3
INC Frost, Samuel	24 24	2	Cai, Bill	22 22	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:

Neg makes Argument that Aff keeps increasing spending but that doesn't matter if Neg concedes the Aff's (2) turn, that spending is good. Aff takes out the NB to the CP/DA to the Aff → only vote on risks of Aff. Articulate how they Aff does more work on IL to mpx / (5) for that mpx.

Good Job! 😊

Kunes, Kevin

Room:Kenna 216 Start time:4:00 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL Prelim round 6

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: Tan & Wang		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Moore, Zakiya	25	3	Wang, Brian	27	2
Turner, Shah	30	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:

Shah
Great speaker, best I've seen at tournament. Speech a bit jumbled but provided specific plans. On transparency, provided pretty well that Aff was NOT a main target, but did not tell me why "cash, liability" was a bit blank. Very good evidence of why USFG needs to be the actor, but (just selling on FARA clarity or preference I need for Justice). Evidence for other would be nice.

Zakiya
A few speaking stumbles but solid evidence. Significantly attacked DA, (esp. if added on) 1st constructive and capitalized on phone concession. A little clumsy with evidence gives the impression speaker is not familiar with evidence. Definitly won T, but a response to CP and final cliff notes were without evidence backing it up, even though you had some analysis such.

Justin
Solid attack of FARA in 1st constructive and in CX. I found the "phone is smaller" counter arguement convincing. In rebuttal I could not tell if your standard was metal or coding. Said trials were good but did not say why metal/coding stuff was better than \$ at time stated.

RFD

Brian
Stumbled when voice went lower, but political context and phrasal cliff notes are well used. Cause lots of deeped arguments (including PAA, indirect, hegemony, Tuberculosis etc. Tuberculosis). A little disorganized towards end of rebuttal, but previous points were strong.

Mileo, Paul

Room: Daly 106 Start time: 4:00 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL Prelim round 6

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.

2:14
2:50
5:09

Aff: A & A			Neg: Kataria & Li		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
2 Contreas-Ramazzini, Hector	22	4	2 Kataria, Rachit	24	2
1 Garcia, Diego	25	1	1 Li, Sidney	23	3

1:00
4:36
1:37
8:

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:

~~Andrade~~

Schletzbaum
militias

Phillips, Les

Room: Arts 246 Start time: 4:00 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL Prelim round 6

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: Irving-Thomas & Marquez		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Schilling, Michelle	4	27	Irving-Thomas, Lenard	3	29
DeGiovanni, Trent	1	30	Marquez, Chris	2	29

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:

Michelle little high pitched or smeared point but thanks for slowing down on tag + site

Irving - So... If I hadn't watched "Resolved" last month I would have been blindsided... Disingenuous point was with spread verse followed by 30 seconds of spread at the end.

Trent - interesting. Did u have a pre brief for this... Totally unprepared unlike Michelle

Chris recent mix of args but both sides could clash more

Case - Not fix roads was chance for N.W.

Racist @d - K...
So. Aff falls to present personal narratives
However, Aff does attack Negs @ on its ground with the education arg, and the neg doesn't reciprocate with site on the making impact loss of culture to rights + win + we are go

Aff has cultural specific args...

Flores, Joseph

Room: St. Josephs 109 Start time: 4:00 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL Prelim round 6

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: Atlas & Patou		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Adduri, Abhinav	27	4	Patou, David	28	1
Bharadwaj, Tejas	27.5	2	Atlas, Ben	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:

Neg wins Justice adv turn
 Neg wins no job creation
 Risk of link to accident

Capara, Colin

Room: St. Josephs 309 Start time: 4:00 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL Prelim round 6

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.

MSJ Aff: Chatterjee & Merchant			JV Neg: Guilford & Nguyen		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Merchant, Riyaz	29.5	2	Guilford, Alec	29	1
Chatterjee, Kushal	27.5	4	Nguyen, Brian	28	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:

Conceded impact calc in the IAR and conceded
 case solwency on the ep in the IAR clear the
 aff to not solve D/A with just a risk of
 a link.

Amcarants

Schletzbaum, Charles

Room:Kenna 104 Start time:4:00 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational**POL Prelim round 6**

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: Skyline - Gangaso and Xu		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Tso, Dustin	27	4	Xu, Anna	29	1
Zhao, Wilson	27	3	Gangaso, Gabe	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:

FW - some clash / actual debate prob. higher with neg Flw
 - whiteness entrenched edu & ⑤ if neg can
 never predict specific ④ cases & bond
 by res.

Aff - ④ contextualization of event. ④ A within cap ④
 concedes alt.

- Perm ④ ⑤ framing CAP within whiteness ④ ⑤ need
 full rejection from society

- ^{alt} CAP solves aff ① and CAP ①

If you don't agree with this decision, be more specific
 about argumentation and contextualizing arguments!

P.S. More clash!

Scheer, Chris

Room:Kenna 109 Start time:4:00 PM

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

POL Prelim round 6

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: Tuggle-Whitemore		
Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank	Speaker	Speaker Points	Speaker Rank
Kalra, Nikhil	28	3	Tuggle, Emily	29	1
Joshi, Varun	28	4	Whitemore, Cooper	28.5	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:

This is one of those "draw" debates where nobody has a clear obvious path to victory. In the end, I go Neg based on overall better debating, particularly on the Coal DA & T.

Remember, all: More framework and impact/calc in rebuttals makes it easier for judges to weigh!

~~Appreciate~~ Good luck