

OPEN
Parli
ROUND I

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	JamLog RT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Lakshmi Ramesh	27	4
	Lucas Tung	29	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Poly SS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	AJ Singh	28	2
	Pete Sanders	27	3

The better debating was done by the Lucas Tung from Affirmative team
AFF or NEG TEAM OF CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Padmaja

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Lucas covered good points. He focused on the topic and was a strong debater. Both the teams were covering their points and supporting what they want U.S. to do. Overall it was a good debate.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	BisO'D WZ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Caitlin Walsh	28	3 rd
2	Marco Zepeda	29.9	1 st

NEGATIVE

POS	NotDam CK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
3	Aislinn Foltz-Colhour	28.5	2 nd
4	Allie Kerkhoff	25	4 th

The better debating was done by the AFF from Caitlin Walsh & Marco
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: NO

Signed: Madeline (EVHS)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- 1A - very confident, good eye contact, very clear contention able to justify all contention.
- 2A - Excellent speaking skills, provides valid justification during cross examination. Good leadership skills & clarity in speaking. Very organized & structured.
- 1N → Excellent speaker, confident, good eye contact
- 2N - good, lot of clarity but slightly shaky confidence

RFD

I vote affirmative resolution on the arguments about saving money & nato presence by pulling out the reser forces from Afghanistan was more convincing with impactly border issues between 2 countries.
I felt the AFF provided more justified argumen
convincing contention with facts than neg, so I

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Sumprep LD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Daniel Loran	28.5	3 rd
	Ian DeLisle	27.5	4 th

NEGATIVE

POS	Leland NW	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Bang Nguyen	29.9	1 st
	Young Wu	29.5	2 nd

The better debating was done by the NEG from Bang, Young
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: NO

Signed: Madhuson (EVHS)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Excellent presentation by both Neg, good presentation skills eye contact & gesture. Good clarity & hold on contention.

Aff was good though but didn't have enough evidences or justification to prove their contention.

RFD

I vote Neg resolution because they provide very convincing argument on what happen if all the funding to Iran is stopped & how it can impact the oil price to US & lead to nuclear moments with the country & neighboring country of Iran. Good justification on how it will impact citizen of the Iran.

Ashlyn Turner

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	NotDam BD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Shruthi Basireddy	27	4
1	Meredith Duflock	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Milpitas ZO	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Ahsan Zahid	28.5	1
2	Patrick O'Brien	27.5	3

The better debating was done by the NEG from MILPITAS ZO
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Ashlyn Turner

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I buy the arg the neg is making that congress would never pass the plan, but I don't really have an impact to that (except that we "lose florida"). If we don't have florida or republicans vote for the plan it doesn't mean it won't pass. I'm left with the choice of who protects welfare of Israel, the globe, and the future best: status quo or decreasing aid. Either stopping funding doesn't stop war and cutting aid means they would cut ^{other} important programs or we have a moral obligation to stop war and we can do something to stop it. I don't think the aff has a good answer to the neg's arg that removing ~~Israeli~~ funding to Israelies will mean an end to the violence. I vote for the squo because the plan wouldn't guarantee an end to war.

OH! And there shouldn't be a road map before the IAC.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Prospect SL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Krishnan Srinivasan	28	3
2	Aaron Latta	27.5	4

NEGATIVE

POS	GraBay TA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Michael Tom	29.5	1
2	Gokul Asokan	28.5	2

The better debating was done by the NEG from GraBay TA
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Ashelyn Turner

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The aff needs to impact args more. You say "one shot one kill" but what's the impact? Fairness? Education? War? The neg does a GREAT job using examples strategically and impacting everything. Aff should have just gone all in on war good/inevitable and democracy is awesome. I vote on the arg that installing democracies abroad only leads to more violence.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Wash ST	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Manveer Singh	29	1
	Abhinav Tripathy	26	2

NEGATIVE

POS	BisO'D RC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Tim Ring	29.9 30	1
	Jordan Crosby	29	2

The better debating was done by the NEG from Tim Ring and Jordan Crosby
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Marwa Ahmed

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The NEG team was more convincing. Their reasons why the US forces should leave residuals were clear and logical. Refuting the affirmative team's points made sense.

The AFF team stated many points why the US forces should leave, some of the points were convincing but a few others were not ex. "money wasted". The AFF team changed and added a couple of points at the end.

The AFF team had good reasons but needed to support them and reinforce them more through the debate.

Good Job both Teams!

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Saratoga KP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Ishaan Kolluri	28	4
2	Neil Prasad	29	1

NEGATIVE

POS	BisOD AP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Nicholas Accinelli	28	3
1	Nadia Perl	29	2

The better debating was done by the Neg from BisOD AP
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- USFG should send Milt. Aid to Syrian opposition.
The Aff does not present any Incentives for Turkey to do as the US wants. Coalition groups are too unstable to ensure any form of security.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Leland KT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Donghun Kang	27	3
1	Robert Tseng	27	2

NEGATIVE

POS	NotDam ZP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Ciara Zambo	26	4
2	Michelle Pashby	29	1

The better debating was done by the Neg from NotDam ZP
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: Robert Tseng

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

-USFG should substantially ↓ aid to Israel

The Aff was unable to fully support contentions +
Impacts with ~~the~~ concrete arguments. No establishing
of societal welfare.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	GraBay HO	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Justin Habashi	27	2
1	Nicolas Ontiveros	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Wash DC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Rohit Dhar	27	3
2	Surya Chittadi	26	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Granite Bay
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Paul Pashby

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: U.S.F.G should substantially decrease its aid to ISRAEL

3 points

1. SAVE LIVES
2. SAVE MONEY
3. sentiment of other countries about U.S

U.S. would still defend ISRAEL but would cap aid from 3 bil to 1 bil
 Non democratic countries would gain more power (IRAN, SYRIA)
 ISRAEL DOES NOT USE ALL MONEY ON MILITARY, USES IT AGAINST U.S.
 U.S would rather have ISRAEL AS THE STRONG military power than another COUNTRY.

AFF. WAS able to MORE clearly state the case for reducing financial aid to ISRAEL

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Leland CY	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Joseph Chen ^R	27	2
1	Grant Yun ^L	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	SumPrep/GS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Julia Gross	27	3
2	Alexander Stoddard	26	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Leland
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Paul Kelly

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: USFG should send military aid to the SYRIAN opposition

- U.S. send 40,000 troops currently in JAPAN & VIETNAM
 1. stop violence
 2. No mediator
 3. spill over EFFECT - SYRIANS flee to other countries

opp - protect U.S. LIVES
CONFLICT between JAPAN & CHINA over islands. NEED U.S. in JAPAN

- U.S. owes it to protect other countries

NEGATIVE WAS UNABLE to provide opposition to AFF. 3 points

Room: St. Claires 2
Flight B: Start 9:00 am
Open, Parliamentary

1

~~Judge 2, FHS~~

CHRISTINA DEKORNA, Bishop O'Donnell HS

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Prospect GS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	② Rohan Grover	27	3
	① Mayank Srivastava	27	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Lynbrook SV	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	① Sohil Sathe	27	1
	② Anirudh Velamuri	28	2

The better debating was done by the NEGATIVE from Lynbrook SV
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: WMA

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

All speeches did very well and displayed excellent oratory skills.

The negative team rebutted the affirmative team's points that poverty is caused by the sanctions (that is unlearned, and humanitarian aid is in place), that Iranian oil will help the US (the US gets no oil from Iran + has robust supplies anyway), and that Iran should be appeased (they don't control the Strait of Hormuz + they have done nothing to show that they want a healthy relationship with the US).

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	MountView LA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Leland Lee	27	2
	Tom Ashkenazi	26	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Prospect CN	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Dan Chiriaev	27	1
	Larry Nguyen	27	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from MountView LA
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Negative did not address the affirmative's contention of nuclear deterrence. Could an all-out Middle East war occur given that Israel has nuclear weapons? ~~Affirmative~~ Negative put forth that an all-out war would occur; affirmative rebutted that Israel has a nuclear deterrence; negative did not address this in rebuttal. Both teams did well.

Room: Mission W
Flight [] Start 9:00 am
Open Parliamentary

1

Judge 1, FHS

Padmeja Banda

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL ND SJ

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	St. Mary RD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Roxanne Rodrigues	26	4
	Serena Duggal	27	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Everg HB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Aamir Hasnat	28	1
	Ryan Boun	26	3

The better debating was done by the Aamir Hasnat from Negative team
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Padmeja

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aamir was very confident, arguing to the point. I think the affirmative team should be more stronger and come up with more important points. I would say it would be a good debate if ~~both~~ ^{the affirmative team} the teams was strong enough.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

"USFG should leave no residual forces in Afghanistan when it withdraws."

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Everg GZ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Brighu Gollabinnie	27	4
2	Kenny Zhang	27.5	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga AC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Shauray Agrawal	28	2
1	Justin Chiang	28.5	1

The better debating was done by the AFF from Everg GZ
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: Paul Sonkowsky

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The AFF points about trust of the U.S., the U.S.' "soft power," and the potential economic impact/benefit were not sufficiently knocked down by NEG. Claims that oil prices will go up if we stay, and Egypt may invade Gaza if we keep support troops there, may be questionable, but if true they do represent "net benefit" for the AFF side, and just saying they are irrelevant doesn't sufficiently negate them. The debate about which case would lead to a bigger war was harder to follow, and less conclusive to me.

Room: Eng 326
Flight B: Start 9:00 am
Open Parliamentary

1

~~Khadr, Nureen~~
SONKOWSKY, PAUL

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

"USFG should send military aid to the Syrian opposition"

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	JamLog NF	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Yari Nieves-Rivera	27	4
1	Josue Flores	27.5	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Everg TG	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Sindhoora Tallapragada	27.9	1
1	Kshitij Gaur	27.8	2

The better debating was done by the NEG from Everg TG
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Paul Sorborsky

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both sides had some good points and it was close. On balance NEG had a somewhat better argument about the benefit of a peaceful transition by giving amnesty to Assad in Russia although indeed it is questionable that he would take it. AFF should probably have detailed more about how U.S. military aid would help, especially the peace corps (which is not actually military!).

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

③ USFG Should leave no residual forces in Afghanistan when it withdraws.
 11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	BisO'D BL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Olivia Bernadel-Huey	28	1
2	Lily Zaballos	27	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Everg MV	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Krishna Madhusudan	26	3
4	Kaustubh Vinchure	26	4

The better debating was done by the Aff from Bishop O'Dowd
AFF/NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Lily - Timeframe adopted Obama plan.

1: US - Afghan relations

American troops committing crimes(?)

US military crimes tried in military court??

Remove troops → protect innocent Afghan civ. lives

one piece of evidence

2: Leaving support troops - Against - don't need to be there - they are combat troops.

3: Troops are unnecessary - Afghanistan is capable of taking care of itself.

Krishna - Counterplan →

↳ Humanitarian Aid - Red Cross workers as support troops??

↳ Child Hunger - Datal(?) - How is it a compelling counter plan

How is it a compelling evidence

→ What do you mean by "some troops being necessary?" - not clearly defined

Olivia: clearly identified flaws in the counterplan as it pertains to humanitarian aid vs. combat troops.
 Explanation of support troops - Ex. Iraq.
 Evidence for popular vote support?

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

#2 USFG should send military aid to the Syrian opposition
11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Leland CH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Vincent Chiu	28	1
1	Jason Han	27	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga BO	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Kushol Bhattacharjee	26	3
1	Michael Ong	26	4

The better debating was done by the Aff from Leland
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Eastside

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Overall: Both teams had strong evidence. Contentions & counterplans were clear.

Well done on prep.

A tough vote!

Aff

Neg

- clearly addressed the benefits.

- Would have been ~~been~~ effective to address the weapons not-falling into the wrong hands.

Insisting on Russia + China's dissent in the UN was not the most effective.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Everg KP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Saifullah Khan		
	Harrison Park		

NEGATIVE

POS	NotDam CL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Christina Cherekdjian		
	Surbhi Lohia		

The better debating was done by the aff from

Everg KP

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

No Show waited till 9:45

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

Sunnila Bheerdwaj

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Saratoga High

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	NotDam AL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Nhada Ahmed	28	3
	Kitty Lan	29	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Mountview LH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Daniel Leybzon	29	2
	Sam Holton	27	4

The better debating was done by the Aff from NotDam AL
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Sunnita Bhardway

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Saratoga High

This was a close debate and until the end it ~~was~~ could have gone either way. Both teams made great points about human rights, oil and stability. However the Aff team made ~~best~~ good points about supporting other countries, helping the deficit and oil producers.

Room: Casa 3
Flight A: Start 8:00 am
Open Parliamentary

1

Judge 1, Notre D

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	DiaVal WK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	David Wang	30	1
	Karthik Konath	30	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Gunn KH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Mario Khosla	30	4
	Allen Hao	30	3

The better debating was done by the Aff from DiaVal
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Oral

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

NAME	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
Deland KL		
Karan Kolwalkar		
Thomas Luh		

NEGATIVE

POS	NAME	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	BisO'D AL		
	Justin Adsuara		
	Chris Leboa		

The better debating was done by the Neg from BisO'D
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: David M

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Wd Shaw

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Wash KM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Lemar Karimi	28	2
1	Vignesh Muruganatham	27	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Poly DK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Nishanth Dara	26	4
1	Kartikaya Krishna	27	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from Poly DK
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: Matt O'Brien (MILITARY)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RES: USFG should stop using drone strikes as a method of assassination

NOTE: More solidly supported contentions for NEG. poor facts on AFF

Comments:

- AFF should have used more specifics rather than just "other countries", "lots of casualties", "Middle East".
- Good use Al-Awarthi (sp?) example.
- Cabinet isn't "filled with lobbyists", cost of drones wrong.
- Attacks like Seal Team 6 pretty costly!

- NEG ✓ pretty soft negates of AFF's contentions, two completely off base
- ✓ Solid with factual support of contentions
- cleaner and well organized final presentation

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Saratoga AU		
	Elnaz Ahmedi		
	Krishna Unadkat		

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	St. Mary RC		
2	Aidan Reed	27	2
1	Adriana Contreras	27	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from St. Mary
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

SARATOGA Team did not show

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Fox JaKi	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Saksham Jain	28	2
3	Jaewon Kim	27	3

NEGATIVE

POS	JamLog MC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Mark Mabie	25	4
2	Ashley Chang	30	1

The better debating was done by the Neg from JamLog MC
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

USFG should substantially decrease its aid to Israel,
 A 7 ~~7~~ A
 N 7
 A 7 Aff on solves
 N 7 for econ
 N 5 not enough
 A 5
 -also dehum
 should have been
 brought up before
 voting

N
 Neg War is bad
 but still is better
 -Neg was on solvency
 and impacts

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Leland DS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Sam Deghuee	1	26
3	Dominic Sonkowsky	4	25

NEGATIVE

POS	Everg AV	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Ridhi Arun	2	27
2	Devangi Vivrekar	3	27

The better debating was done by the Aff from Leland DS
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: *Anthony [Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

USFG should send military aid to the Syrian opposition

A

N

can't drop Nuc impact

WM on plan

and MAD

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE


POS	MountView EA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Kyle Evans	29	3
2	Mohan Avula	28	4

NEGATIVE

POS	JamLog CT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Jesus Cardenas	30	1
1	Sean Trinh	29	2

The better debating was done by the NEG from James Logan CT
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- The USFG should send military aid to the Syrian opposition.
- Evans - good clear points, interesting choice of impacts
- TRINH - good flow, good job poking at the affirmative's contentions. it really helped with your standard of feasibility, stick to 1POI at a time
- AVULA - no matter what kind of debate this is, \$ is a HUGE issue, organize your papers & flow in a way that doesn't get you confused while you're speaking, good clear flow was maintained
- Cardenas - good rebuttals and responses to the POIs. slow and clear speaker.
- TRINH - good job raising your voice in the more important issues, well done poking at the aff's case
- EVANS - thank you for being loud, well done talking about the importance of aiding the people, good answer to POI, ^{good point} _{about stopping} _{provin}

Both teams maintained a clean and clear debate. The evidence was well-stated and successfully helped both cases. While I personally believe that the US should aid Syria, the negation poked enough holes in the affirmative's plan to make it unsuccessful. Overall this was a ^{good} _{int} debate.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

(2) USFL should send military aid to the Syrian opposition

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	BisO'D VY	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Cate Vegis	28	2
2	Daylen Yang	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Sumprep FC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Nick Fantuzzi	25	4
2	Kevin Cannon	26	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from BisO'D VY
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature] Jesuit Sacramento

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF (Vegis/Yang): Positive: Logic + Evidence = Excellent! Just War + Saves lives + Increase Regional stability. Description of how to define "Just War theory" very convincing = Explanation clarity makes it easy on judge. Validation of 3 opening rebuttals allowed now supporting evidence/holds = Solid. Rebuttals and questioning of Neg elevated weaknesses in opponents.
 Improve: Focused too much on validating C4 (Just war) thus balance act validation/logic for all 3 contentions = validation for C3 (stability) was weakest.

Neg (Fantuzzi/Cannon): Positive: Laid out contentions framework and flowed relatively well between partners: ~~Cost/Benefit~~ analysis + Religious war + Relation with Russia/China. Furthered solvency = sanctions a plus. Well done managing questions and commanding use of your speaking time.
 Improve: Dropped 2/3 of AFF's contentions = very little to no rebuttals. Need to tie together numerous holistic stats: started to hear this at times (demographics Saudi; role of religion) but couldn't clearly link ~~to~~ together in logical manner.

AFF Position 2 (Yang): Positive: Validation with independent evidence of partner/contentions was solid = you didn't just repeat; instead you told the story with more evidence. Rebuttals solid = not using ^{U.S.} troops effectively refutes Neg; Assad still killing shows sanctions are working. Strong delivery: eye contact + voice + consistent tone
 Improve: Change up your tone (elevate volume) to further hammer home conviction.

over →

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

1. USFG should substantially decrease its aid to Israel.

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Lynbrook JY	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Sujeeth Jinesh	25	3
2	Cameron Yang	24	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga BK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Rohan Bhardwaj	28	1
1	Ajay Kirpekar	27	2

The better debating was done by the NEG from Saratoga BK
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Michael Jesuit Sacramento

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg (Bhardwaj/Kirpekar): Positive: Logic, evidence, rebuttal, and delivery (other than time) solid & clear. Contentions and rebuttal on AFF' definitions and contentions were convincing. Flow was excellent with most contentions supported by evidence: most powerful points = ① peace currently not effective enough so why make worse ② Israel is ally = democracy in middle east ③ Neg provided no relevancy/support.

Improve: Rebuttal on Aff Cont 2 (Israel mistreating palestinians & taking land) not supported well. Poor time management.

Aff (Jinesh/Yang): Positive: started strong ~~strong~~ framing definitions, value, and contentions. Clearly communicated strongest rebuttal = not eliminating aid, just reducing.

Improve: Lost momentum as a team as no debate suggested: I could see/feel it from both speakers. Recommend consistent strong delivery (shows confidence) throughout. Lots of repetition of key contentions topic sentences with little evidence to support "belief statements".

Position 2 Neg (Bhardwaj): Positive: Flow 100% consistent with partners opening contentions & added evidence to strengthen. ~~clearly demonstrated~~ clearly demonstrated how Aff definitions and lack of relevancy were weaknesses. Strongest delivery of all 4 speakers: use of hands & eye contact & strong voice. Presentation style demonstrated conviction!!

Improve: Glosed over validating contention that it is morally unjust to ^{hang} ~~reduce~~ a democratic ally out to dry. Provided good evidence on partner contentions = but should show in evidence (or even a belief stat) more often on refuting AFF contentions.

Position 1 Neg (Kirpekar) Positive: Excellent use of imagery to paint a picture of what you are saying. Clear contentions (step transition; morally unjust to leave Israel; save \$/oil leverage) strong convincing voice.

Improve: Time management (first Neg speech went long); validation for C3 (saving billions of \$) got lost to support. use more evidence or belief to establish conviction.

OVER →

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Sumprep BP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Amanda Barth	26	3
	Bixby Ponteri	26	4

NEGATIVE

POS	MSJ CH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Alice Cheng	28 27	2
	Rebecca Hong	28	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from MSJ CH
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: -

Signed: Raj Sunder (SUNDER RAS)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams argued about the time line, 2014 vs. 5 years.
 Since AFF defined it as 5 years, Neg cannot change to 2014. AFF was correct.
 Neg brought up Nuclear which was mere speculation. AFF got us right here also.
 Both teams did not grasp the title, when and did not argue
 the fact "when the withdraw happens" should there be residual
 or no residual fees". Most of the arguments were off topic.
 The reason for AFF vote was all the three contentions
 were refuted by Neg very well.

① Monetary benefit. AFF neg.
 - Less monetary (residual)
 - National Security more important than \$\$\$

② Less reason for terror → Residual fees or not terror is in culture

③ Better lives for soldiers → - Most Soldiers will be back.
 - Soldiers, when they sign up, they sign up to fight.