

OPEN

PARLI

ROUND 2

A

Warner, Dave

McGrew, Bill Jesuit Sacrumank

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

#2
When in conflict, U.S. citizens should prefer economic growth over environmental protection.

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

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Leland WZ	POINTS	RANKS
1	Ashton Wu	27	3
2	Clifford Zhang	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	MountView LA	POINTS	RANKS
1	Leland Lee	27	2
2	Tom Ashkenazi	25	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Leland WZ
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:

AFF (Wu/Zhang) positive: Overall set the framework and maintained better flow through entire debate as it relates to defining "conflict" = war and then linking to prioritizing economic growth (hunting/moral) over env. protection to address short-term conflicts (war). Managed time during constructive presentation. Used just enough evidence and examples to support logic of all three contentions.

Improve: 2 of 3 contentions were supported by logic during "peace time" (debate sets the pace of "during conflict")
Left 2.5 minutes on table in rebuttal

NEG (Lee/Ashkenazi) positive: Started strong by convincing we that "conflict" can be more than just war (but needed to carry this more effectively in constructive speeches.) Did elevate solvency in Contention 2 by opening constructive speeches by suggesting regulation ^{can} link enviro to economic growth even during conflict = but needed to carry this more effectively to validate. Good use of #5 evidence: #82B.

Improve: Flow between speakers needs more consistency; and, more validation/evidence needed to carry opening constructive contentions/arguments. Time mgmt: had to stop position 2 as fired out in excess (stopped at 7:40); and position 1 left 2 minutes on table in rebuttal.

AFF Position 2 (Zhang) positive: Delivery very good = strong voice, clear speech, change in tone demonstrated confidence with topic in validating his partner. Built effectively on 3 contentions raised by partner. Good rebuttal to pointing out lack of evidence in Neg contentions #1 (China). ~~Correctly~~ Correctly points out that debate needs to focus on "when in conflict"; not when in "peace time."

Improve: Logic made sense but supporting with evidence or belief can strengthen arguments.

NEG Position 1 (Lee) positive: Most consistent/convincing delivery of 4 speakers: eye contact, voice clarity and tone and posture (stood up straight and looked me right in the eye). Very convincing logic supported by evidence/belief when demonstrating importance of long-term sustainability (env. protection) = however did not effectively carry to link to "when in conflict." Solid & clearly framed rebuttal.

Improve: Time mgmt = left 2 minutes on table in rebuttal which could have been used to expand/carry argument that conflict is just not related to war.

Over →

B

2

~~Lim, Wee Lee~~
CAMACHO, ERIK

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 MC	POINTS	RANKS
1	Mark Mabie	28	4
2	Ashley Chang	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	MountView EA	POINTS	RANKS
1	Kyle Evans	30	1
2	Mohan Avula	27	3

The better debating was done by the NEG from MountView EA
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:

AFF
PMC: 5:08 Poststart!

NEG
LOC: "When in conflict"
The only frame of conflict actively debated was present tense framed.

VI NEG
1) When in conflict
↳ were in a war
↳ were finically struggling
Increased Threat to Nat Security
N/A

AFF
"When in Conflict" was handled way too late.

Neg: Your econ impacts totally suck! Weak sauce lol
You totally need to stack pile tangible impacts.
I don't quite feel the effects of your portayed problems

- Threat to Econ more apreat.
- 2) Deaths
↳ result of trying to protect Nat Security
- 3) Burden → Dropped hard by the AFF
- 4) Threat Analysis

RFD: I dig the "Overview/Burden/Observation"
Clearly is result of nat security, more threat level problems delivered by NEG. more "preference of Evidence": suppose.

A

2

~~Lim, Wee Lee~~
CAMACHO, ERIK

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 CH	POINTS	RANKS
2	Vincent Chiu	28 30	1
1	Jason Han	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Prospect CN	POINTS	RANKS
1	Dan Chiriaev	25	4
2	Larry Nguyen	27	2 3

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

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

Signed: E Camacho

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Dan! Stop walking around the room.!!!!!!!

Neg: Case was structured very JV-esque
You really need to learn standard sign posting/organizational terms

Vincent! Thanks for knowing Japan's place in the Global GDP!!

RFD: OFF Case was so blown out of proportion and refutations to AFF case were virtually non-responsive.

Extend AFF case ->

Room: St. Claires 3

Start: 12:30

B

2

McGrew, Bill

Jesuit Sacramento

SCU Dempsey-Cronin Invitational

open 8/15

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 CL	POINTS	RANKS
	Christina Cherekdjian		
	Surbhi Lohia		

NEGATIVE

POS	BisO'D WZ	POINTS	RANKS
	Caitlin Walsh		
	Marco Zepeda		

Dropped

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

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

Signed: Bill McGrew

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF Team Dropped - No show; Confirmed with NotDam representative

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 CT	POINTS	RANKS
	Jesus Cardenas	25.6	3
	Sean Trinh	25.1	2

NEGATIVE

POS	DiaVal WK	POINTS	RANKS
	David Wang	28.9	1
	Karthik Konath	28.7	2

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

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

Signed: Baldwin/Cass

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative — ~~got Karthik~~ Not able to give me any convincing statement.

Negative — I like negative because their statement that what is the call of human right? No. You cannot human life if you don't have life. According to me life has important. you have to have a life to get human rights.

B

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	Poly DK	POINTS	RANKS
	Nishanth Dara	1	28.9
	Kartikeya Krishna	2	28.8

NEGATIVE

POS	Leland KT	POINTS	RANKS
	Donghun Kang	4	26.8
	Robert Tseng	3	26.9

The better debating was done by the Affirmative from Polytechnic
AFF/NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Baljit Singh Kaur

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative → I left support affirmative
they are ~~good~~ community e.g.
women sup to abortion has more
strong right than the contribute
Abuse rights have more
value. Con did not failed to give
women equal rights.

Negative → I can not bear
any community
arguments / statement.

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 AC	POINTS	RANKS
3	Shauray Agrawal	22	4
1	Justin Chiang	24	3

NEGATIVE

POS	BisO'D VY	POINTS	RANKS
4	Cate Vegis	25	2
2	Daylen Yang	26	1

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

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

Signed: Delinda Dene

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

When in conflict, US citizens should value integrity over ~~effectiveness~~ ^{effectiveness} in their politicians.

integrity = law abiding, moral effectiveness, ability of getting things done, trust deficit

System who integrity - for few only those with money power can corrupt

- undemocratic

- not effective

change def → integrity - Lobbyist?

(50)

Neg

Super pacs - not politicians
Not politician Bernie Madoff - ponzi scheme

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 CK	POINTS	RANKS
1	Aislinn Foltz-Colhour	26	1
3	Allie Kerkhoff	23	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga BO	POINTS	RANKS
4	Kushol Bhattacharjee	25	2
2	Michael Ong	24	3

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

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

Signed: Delinda Dene

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

When in conflict, US citizens should prefer transparency to secrecy in matters of international relations

honesty = transparency
by gov individuals

American values

AFF gov issue safety
democracy undermined if no transparency
3 very convoluted (accountability)

only - soldiers need to know
(background checks) compromise security

Neg citizen benefit from secrecy - safety
people will be bribed for info -
(terrorist will try to get info)

B

Arron Lm Shro
Cnl
Lutterm

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 LH	POINTS	RANKS
PM	Daniel Leybzon	29.0	1
MG	Sam Holton	27.6	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Everg AV	POINTS	RANKS
OM	Ridhi Arun	26.6	3
LO	Devangi Vivrekar	26.3	2

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

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

Signed: Arron Lm Shro

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

PM: excellent GOS in speaking and establishing the round, you had a nice set up and rebuttal but need some solid points in any new examples, rebuttal of the other was a new example and could have been better, it won't be a counter argument you

MG: You seemed nervous. Although you were able to refute both their responses & contentions and similar responses, stay organized, you can refer responses of the other your responses but staying organized is key, and would have helped remember the 3rd contention which was dropped.

OM: Good job responding to their points, Although you did drop one of the responses, pointing out the drop of your third contention was a key anchor in this debate.

LO: Probably the most calm speech given you did a good GOS refuting their contentions and rebutting their points, I do not have any negative things to say, if anything have clearer arguments in contentions debated like that it seemed to come down to which one first in short ~~same~~ good job.

Decision - Neg. They accurately give responses to the value or not benefits ultimately the decision came down to the drop of the third contention

A

Aaron Linsms
 Cal
 Letterman

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 ZP	POINTS	RANKS
PM	Ciara Zambo	28.6	1
MOB	Michelle Pashby	24.5	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Wash AA	POINTS	RANKS
LO	Jamie Avery	27.3	2
MO	Stephanie Andrade	25.3	3

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

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

Signed: Aaron Linsms

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

PM: Good job setting up the debate and successfully linking to the values, look up more when speaking and know how to discuss questions at its almost time

MOB: You were able to successfully refute many of their points but ~~dropped~~ ^{you} dropped their example of the Clean water Act which was a very strong point in terms of linking the economy and environment

LO: Good job on refuting their points and establishing contentions, but I feel you needed more points on "the link" yes there is a link but why is it significant mainly the examples were too term specific while Although they didn't call you on that, you still needed impacts on the economy as well

MO: Good job refuting their points and pointing out they dropped your impact/example of the Clean water Act, needed more economic impacts though

Overall AFF was able to reach the resolution and value of this debate more successfully because they gave both environmental and economic impacts that ~~protect~~ protect the welfare of the U.S.

B

Shivajee Sankarshi/Saraboj

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	Milpitas ZO	POINTS	RANKS
1	Ahsan Zahid	30	1
2	Patrick O'Brien	25	2

NEGATIVE

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

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

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

Signed: Shivajee Sankarshi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The AFF team won the debate. They argued that protecting national security interests places the nation over the individual and they is more important. Also, protecting the national security interests is helpful to economic growth. — without national security there will be no economy. Ahsan is a very compelling speaker. He presented his points very succinctly.

A

Shivajee Sandarshi/Sarotoga

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 CT	POINTS	RANKS
2	Namrata Challa	23	4
1	Shivani Thombare	25	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Prospect GS	POINTS	RANKS
2	Rohan Grover	30	1
1	Mayank Srivastava	27	2

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

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

Signed: Shivajee Sandarshi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The NEG team won this debate by making a very strong case for preferring environmental protection over the ~~scope of effect~~ ^{irreversibility and economy} of the negative effects of ~~not protecting the environment~~.

They cited two strong points

1. Irreversibility - the ^u effect negative effects of not protecting the environment are irreversible.

2. Scope - the ~~at~~ negative effects of not protecting the environment affect every body and not just individuals.

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	TEAM	POINTS	RANKS
1	Everg GZ Brighu Gollabinnie	30	1
2	Kenny Zhang	28	3

NEGATIVE

POS	TEAM	POINTS	RANKS
1	MSJ CH Alice Cheng	29	2
2	Rebecca Hong	28	4

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

When in conflict US citizens should prefer economic growth over environmental protection.

- Gollabinnie → thank you for speaking up, good attention-grabbing introduction, good focus on impacts, point about chinese people choosing econ → make sure to discuss RESULTS of how that helped china.
- Cheng → no matter what, dont use the phrase "we agree". It gets misunderstood very easily. Had a lot of knowledge about facts, good job connecting impacts with contentions, make sure to poke more holes in aff case, good speaking, your last speech is a huge deal; ^{emphasize} that
- Zhang → keep in order with your flow. it makes the debate easier to understand and takes out room for error, well done defending case, make sure to connect what people are concerned with with how it affects the world. Did it work for china when they chose econ?
- Hong → good focus on impact, thank you for being loud

Both teams did a great job emphasizing net benefits. Make sure to focus on what the other team was saying instead of overpushing your own points. Talk about what would be bad if the other team's case won. The affirmative overall defended their case better because emphasized the preference of the citizens

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	Gunn KH	POINTS	RANKS
1	Mario Khosla	28	1
2	Allen Hao	26	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga AU	POINTS	RANKS
1	Elnaz Ahmadi	25	4
2	Krishna Unadkat	27	2

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

When in conflict, US citizens should prioritize national security interests over economic interests.

Khosla - strong contentions, think about giving focus to what would happen if the neg case won and econ is more imp. use all of your time, good final speech.

Ahmadi - cut down on the ums; talk heavily about impacts; if you want to change definitions or standards, be clear as to why your definition

Hao - make sure to keep organized and on task. Always be prepared for your speech, connect your metaphors clearly to your contentions

Unadkat - good point about national security being DEPENDENT on economy, make sure you have a clear flow, work on eyecontact, work on how to clearly rebutt points and use all your time, I know you were rushed but wait until end to pack

The affirmative should not ask for its opposition to repeat their contentions. If you don't hear, then it's your loss. While this may be the case, overall, the affirmative convinced me that their impacts are stronger. The negation created a better case, but they didn't support it as successfully as the affirmative. Those are the two main parts to having a successful debate.

A

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	Team	POINTS	RANKS
Leland NW			
1	Bang Nguyen	30	1
2	Young Wu	30	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Team	POINTS	RANKS
Wash ST			
1	Manveer Singh	30	3
2	Abhinav Tripathy	29	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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Oral

A

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 BL	POINTS	RANKS
1	Olivia Bernadel-Huey	29	4
2	Lily Zaballos	20	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Leland DS	POINTS	RANKS
2	Sam Deghuee	30	2
1	Dominic Sonkowsky	30	3

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

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

Signed: Jimi Mufloc

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I thought all the debaters did a really nice job. I think the individual rankings ~~but~~ don't really support the efforts you all put in, but we are required to do it.

I gave the nudge over to the opposition based on their approach in opposing your value plus advocating their own, which was not opposed by government on several points. opposition also effectively cited several sources as compared to government, which cited fewer.

It was a really close debate and both teams presented logical arguments and rebuttals. You were also respectful of the judge and each other. I do think Zaballos should have taken me questions during her time, although I don't believe it was because she felt unprepared

B

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	RANKS
1	Amanda Barth	27	4
2	Bixby Ponteri	28	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga RY	POINTS	RANKS
1	Sudeep Raj	29	1
2	Jerry Yang	28	2

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

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

Signed: Jeri Duflock

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I gave the nod to Saratoga because I thought they did a good job of opposing your arguments and proposing their for which were not effectively rebutted. I would also have liked more real world examples in the first argument instead of book references (although interesting)

There was a bit of a breakdown in the ~~government~~ ^{negative} side with Yang's argument as I felt it did not follow a logical progression. I was also put off by his approach to dealing with questions from gov- disdainful & dismissive. However, overall negative's side followed a more coherent approach and their speakers were slightly better in this fight.

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	RANKS
1	Saifullah Khan	27	4
2	Harrison Park	28	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Leland CY	POINTS	RANKS
1	Joseph Chen	29	1
2	Grant Yun	28	2

The better debating was done by the Neg from Leland CY
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:

I believe that the negative side ~~was~~ had won this debate, therefore I vote for the negative side because they counter argued all of the affirmative sides arguments really well. The affirmative side did not address the resolution accordingly, the affirmative side never stated that when in conflict, as to why economic growth should be valued more than environmental growth. The negative side supported all of their arguments with it.

B

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	RANKS
2	Krishnan Srinivasan	27	2
1	Aaron Latta	30	1

NEGATIVE

POS	GraBay HO	POINTS	RANKS
1	Justin Habashi	27	3
2	Nicolas Ontiveros	27	4

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

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

Signed: Joe [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I vote for the positive side in this debate because the positive/affirmative side counter argued every argument that was discussed, the affirmative side also made the pro choice / pro life debate with more clear use of evidence and made all of the negative side arguments not as valid.

B

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 AL	POINTS	RANKS
2	Justin Adsuara	27	2
1	Chris Leboa	26	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Sumprep LD	POINTS	RANKS
2	Daniel Loran	25	4
1	Ian DeLisle	27.5	1

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

"When in conflict, US citizens should prefer transparency to secrecy in matters of int'l relations"

Strong arguments over all. Good clash from both sides, and good knowledge and use of evidence to support arguments.

Aff did good job supporting and relating neg's points on constructive speeches, but rebuttal was mostly just restating aff case + didn't answer many neg's points. Neg's arguments therefore carry.

A

2

~~Batra, Pragya~~
Jorgensen, Angela

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 GS	POINTS	RANKS
1	Julia Gross	27	3
2	Alexander Stoddard	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	NotDam BD	POINTS	RANKS
1	Shruthi Basireddy	27.5	2
2	Meredith Duflock	26	4

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

When in conflict, US citizens should value UN Dec. Human Rights above Constitution"

Both sides do a good job of addressing one another good clash, well thought-out arguments.

Aff You took the line of bringing up new arguments on rebuttal. It was iffy, as ~~before~~ it was all based on prior arguments, but the quote from DHR and argument that limiting government power is good could (and should) have been brought in earlier.

Neg Make sure you make time in speeches for questions. It looks bad when you don't allow questions.

Ultimately, aff made the argument that citizenship is arbitrary wasn't adequately answered by neg (their response that conflict = war didn't really answer that point) so aff wins.

12:30 ~~12:30~~ A

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	RANKS
2	Lemar Karimi	26	4
1	Vignesh Muruganatham	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga BK	POINTS	RANKS
2	Rohan Bhardwaj	27	3
1	Ajay Kirpekar	29	1

The better debating was done by the AFT from WASH KM
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Kooli v. [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Lemar:
 + good gesticulation
 + good emphasis
 - weak logical conclusions

Rohan:
 + ~~was~~ good articulation
 + good ~~example~~ evidence.
 - weaker argument

Vignesh
 + very logical arguments
 + good examples
 - could articulate better.

Ajay:
 + great articulation
 + good example from
 - be more concise

Although neg team has a more difficult case to make, they did not
 Neg team has ^{charges to} ~~made~~ some extreme contentions build arguments
 like ^{make} disregarding US Constitution, but did not follow up
 with strong arguments. They could have build a better
 case without going to these extremes.

B

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 TA	POINTS	RANKS
1	Michael Tom	28	3
2	Gokul Asokan	26	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Fox JaKi	POINTS	RANKS
2	Saksham Jain	29	1
1	Jaewon Kim	29	2

The better debating was done by the NEA from Fox JaKi
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:

Michael:
 + good construction of case w/ complex argument
 - Could have chosen a simpler argument
 + good closure

Gokul:
 + good evidence w/ human rights struggle
 - could slow down & articulate better

Jaewon:
 + good rebuttal
 + good articulation
 - could be more courteous

Saksham:
 + good rebuttal
 + good poise & confidence
 - repeating arguments

Neg team is better at both building arguments

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 RC	POINTS	RANKS
2	Tim Ring ²	27	3
1	Jordan Crosby ¹	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Everg MV	POINTS	RANKS
2	² Krishna Madhusudan	26	4
1	¹ Kaustubh Vinchure	27	2

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

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

Signed: Chihsin Wu

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: When in conflict, U.S. citizens should prefer economic growth over environmental protection.

When it comes to topicality argument, you're encouraged also refute other team's contention. Not just use topicality advantages. Because you don't what judge is going to prefer. Basically, both team should debate under two def. for the safe sake.

Based on this, I think the negative did not do a thorough job in refuting ~~the~~ aff's contention. ~~Both~~ -

Both teams, avoid passing notes/words during speech, that makes speaker looks unprepared or not confident.

MO, slow down your speech. make it clearer.

I saw aff team asked question during Mo speech. MO should control the number of times that your opponent can ask. Otherwise, it'll damage your speech consistency. The neg. team should also try to ask questions during aff's speech. ~~to~~

B

Chen, Mr.
Chihsin Wu

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

d should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

VE

HB	POINTS	RANKS
ir Hasnat ²	27	1
n Boun ¹	26	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Sumprep FC	POINTS	RANKS
1	Nick Fantuzzi ¹	26	2
2	Kevin Cannon ³	26	4

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

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

Signed: Chihsin Wu

REASON FOR DECISION: When in conflict, US citizens should ~~value transparency~~ prefer transparency to secrecy in matters of international relations.

Teams need to improve their debate and speech skill to make them in organized way.

AFF wins this debate because neg team didn't address Aff's argument using Wiki's "lie" which cause the problem.

Aff did a better job in rebuttal. However, the argument ~~regarding~~ regarding Korea is the topic like IAO pointed out.

Overall, AFF did slightly better even though both teams still have room to improve.

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	Poly SS	POINTS	RANKS
1A	AJ Singh	24	4
2A	Pete Sanders	26.5	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga KP	POINTS	RANKS
1N	Ishaan Kolluri	27.5	2
2N	Neil Prasad	28	1

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

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

Signed: Dr. Kira

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A → AJ Singh → Communicates his ideas well but need to take a broader picture of the logistics involved.

2A → Pete Sanders → very effective points on his own ~~but~~ and explains his ideas very well. ~~Needs to be less aggressive style~~ ~~and driving others' ideas but no~~ Needs more punch in his statements while contradicting others' statements though.

1N → Ishaan Kolluri → very firm and positively assertive in his viewpoints. Is able to rationalize his ideas without being driven by emotions.

2N → Neil Prasad → the best of the four candidates. Very lucid & lots of clarity in his viewpoints. Very effective communicator.

The Negative team impressed me thoroughly with their various counter-offensives to the other team that a politician ~~being~~ effective in his actions & doing good for the country can be embraced by the crowd even though ~~it is~~ ~~intentional~~.

A

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

When in conflict US^{citizens} should prefer economic growth over environmental protection.

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	RANKS
1	Roxanne Rodrigues	25	4
2	Serena Duggal	20	2

NEGATIVE

POS	JamLog NF	POINTS	RANKS
2	Yari Nieves-Rivera	20	1
1	Josue Flores	20	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from St. Mary's
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:

The decision ultimately came down to who convinced me more abt what US citizens would prefer, and they had many more points relevant to that, so thats why I vote for.

I gave oral critique, but it was a really messy debate. Please take into account what I said about what's needed for policy + value rounds and also don't forget framework!!

Room: St. Claire's 2
Start: 42:30
Open Parliamentary

2

Yarlagadda, Padm

Botsch-McBain, Sarah

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	NAME	POINTS	RANKS
	Leland KL <i>PROP</i>		
	Karan Kolwalkar		
	Thomas Luh		

NEGATIVE

POS	NAME	POINTS	RANKS
	JamLog RT		
	Lakshmi Ramesh		
	Lucas Tung		

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

*Aff team is a drop,
neg wins*

A

2

Judge 4, Notre D

Look at judge 8

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	BisOD AP	POINTS	RANKS
MG	Nicholas Accinelli	29	1
PM	Nadia Perl	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Lynbrook SV	POINTS	RANKS
LO	Sohil Sathe	27	3
MO	Anirudh Velamuri	25	4

The better debating was done by the Aff from Bis OD
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:

Aff: be stronger on torture, you let them frame it as necessary. Weak criteria, no links to morality.

Neg: You said value neither, be very careful how you word that lest you be non-topical. Didn't debate them. They debated you. They addressed your conflicting def and countered. You needed to do that.

Frame work was major. And it was won by Aff. Topicality and moving target won by Aff. In addition Aff responded to neg's alternate def. Neg didn't address Aff's alternative Winner: Aff-BisOD

PM 27-28	LO 27	MO 29	MO 28	LO 27	PM 28
words all Conflict = active opposition between const. Value = morality Criteria = U.D.H.R.	Conflict = their def is symmetric no difference in meaning Constitutionary conflict Value = theirs is value movement Value = utilitarianism, US citizens	when two things clash, which prevails better? non-topical, should not value either state vs individual	Should value constitution over war Conflict = military How do you judge morality?	cannot judge accurately Morality is subjective	They took ground we didn't Moving target
1. torture policy - U.D.H.R = NO TORTURE - Const. cruel unusual punishment - ambiguity - not affected - moralistic value policy	No def of what torture is All symmetric No other means to get info other than torture	Humanitarian. Rights violated. Ex. torture hurts America	we don't use Colin Powell as definition cruel unusual punishment, torture	U.N. def counters their own constitution	not moral for alternative
2. post and gen rights - large scale benefits - employment, current basis - gen. rights should be generated, U.D.H.R.	U.N. has no lawful jurisdiction, so there is no conflict	U.N. should have jurisdiction, better for U.S. citizens.	Employment is not a human right S.S. is a priv. with a right		
	1. U.N. not collective during wartime constitution should rule more because it's better for U.S. citizens	Loss of soft power more conflict	Const. is a direction for nation, U.D.H.R. is not	Const. is only valid gov body, we can only consider	
	2. International obligations const	H.R. we don't value human rights			