

OPEN

PARLI

ROUND 3

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	Saratoga BO	POINTS	RANKS
2	Kushol Bhattacharjee	28.5	1
1	Michael Ong	28	2

## NEGATIVE

POS	Sumprep BP	POINTS	RANKS
1	Amanda Barth	27.5	4
2	Bixby Ponteri	28	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from Saratoga BO  
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 shld sig 1 bdr enfc

sig: a lot  
 border: mex

P: send more agents + lok  
 Build btr barriers

Funding → Imll Prev Fnd

D1: Gov't lose \$ on illeg  
 & pay tax, yet must serve

D2: Gov't can check illeg. status b4 providing servc.

D3: still have to provide medical services

D4: still pay sales tax

D5: dont contb much b/c poor

V1: welfare of US | also ethics + global benefits

V2: Poor edu | They'll come here anyways thru wildners

V3: Fill up prisons | wouldn't help those problems

D4: Take jobs b/c work for less | No Americans take these jobs | They would at fair wage

1. monetary disad  
 a. cost of to prevent  
 b. provide cheap labor | All Os > cost to prevent  
 Labor will remain at 1 wage

2. border enf. hurts wildlife  
 ppl find a way | stronger enf ↓ env harm | building fences thru wildlife | econ of US hospitals > env concerns

3. ↑ racism | 1. said mainly mex | non-topical  
 2. & b/c mex, but illegal

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	Prospect SL	POINTS	RANKS
1	Krishnan Srinivasan	29	1
2	Aaron Latta	28	3

## NEGATIVE

POS	Wash KM	POINTS	RANKS
2	Lemar Karimi	28.5	2
1	Vignesh Muruganatham	27	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Prospect SL  
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:

US: STD, w/ elec & cong  
 - commit elec → states  
 PS: direct election, PRES.

Policy w/ plan + NB  
 Before next election

A1: Eq. rep  
 WY > CA  
 eq. vote is same  
 less voter fraud  
 protects const.

still being reprsd  
 in congress, cancels

states can decide  
 how EC votes are  
 split

if cast w/  
 winner takes  
 all → only 2

#### Voters

1. T | Geoscope + enforcer are important
2. report vote appx good enuf
3. cure for indep. Voters
4. Leg pop mandate | Leg pop mandate
5. disads  
 - Democracy  
 - Abusive min

A2: Acctbl to voters  
 a. strength → ind voters in swing states  
 more fav to a wider margin of country  
 may drive down pork barrel spending

1. wouldn't do anything
2. possibly more conc'd w/ ind voters

A3: Legit pres  
 Giving pop mand → vote

XA re: 1  
 Dont vote b/c they don't care, & b/c EC

1. More rep ↑ turnout

b/c politicians vote for money

B

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

*The USFG should implement national education standards*

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

## AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Wash AA	POINTS	RANKS
1	Jamie Avery	28	1
2	Stephanie Andrade	27.5	2

## NEGATIVE

POS	Everg GZ	POINTS	RANKS
1	Brighu Gollabinnie	27	4
2	Kenny Zhang	27	3

The better debating was done by the Aff from Wash  
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 - Good, energetic, passionate speakers!*

*Neg - Also, clear compelling speakers!*

*Close debate but I agree w/ Aff that Neg should have objected to definition/plan text in 1st speech - Became very muddled as a result. Also agreed w/ Aff that "national" includes all ELL/a policy plan that impacts ELL nationwide.*

A

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

*USFG should provide path to citizenship for illegal immigrants*

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

## AFFIRMATIVE

POS	NotDam BD	POINTS	RANKS
1	Shruthi Basireddy	27	2
2	Meredith Duflock	28	1

## NEGATIVE

POS	Wash ST	POINTS	RANKS
1	Manveer Singh	27	3
2	Abhinav Tripathy	25	4

The better debating was done by the Aff from Not Dam  
AFF of NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: K Walsh

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

*More focused + organized plan + contentions*

*Strong, clear + passionate speakers!*

*Some good points, especially around rewarding illegal behavior + fairness*

*Manveer - You are clearly a strong, experienced debater - Thank you for mentoring a future star -*

*Abhinav - Great effort + competitive spirit 😊*

Room: St. Claires 2  
Start: 4:00 pm  
Open Parliamentary

A

3

~~Schletzbaum, Cha~~  
CHRISTINA MCKENNA

# 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	RANKS
	Kyle Evans	26	1
	Mohan Avula	25	4

## NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga RY	POINTS	RANKS
	Sudeep Raj	26	2
	Jerry Yang	25	3

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

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

Signed: [Signature]

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Speakers spoke - speed was not a problem, but it hampered their clarity in some regards. Need to make sure they are speaking clearly.

Affirmative did not attach the counterplan in their second speech or they then do say it won't work and it did not attach it effectively in the last speech. Rounding error argument was stated, but not explained.

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

Everg CT	POINTS	RANKS
① Namrata Challa	27	3
② Shivani Thombare	26	4

### NEGATIVE

POS	POINTS	RANKS
Gunn KH		
① Mario Khosla	27	2
① Allen Hao	28	1

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

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

Signed: [Signature]

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Debaters need to slow down & make sure that they are getting each of their points out before they move on to the next one. The affirmative case was choppy and hard to follow at times. Also, please review the basic rules - both teams - re protected times and how many people can ask questions at any one time. Affirmative rested much of its case on one gang statistic that was refuted. They were not able to come back and provide any additional information that would have supported their point. Negative did an effective job of rebutting the affirmative points in total. Good sportsmanship was demonstrated by 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	NotDam CK	POINTS	RANKS
	Aislinn Foltz-Colhour	27	1
	Allie Kerkhoff	26.5	2

## NEGATIVE

POS	Prospect GS	POINTS	RANKS
	Rohan Grover	26.3	3
	Mayank Srivastava	26	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Foltz/Kerkhoff  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_ *Lydie B. Witt*

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Teams were well presented + had excellent rapport with their partners + between teams

The negative counterplan was not compelling. The neg team did not counter the evidence that family farmer income should be increased beyond the already high levels documented by the aff team. They did not show that the increase in subsidy would not be offset by decreasing ~~supply~~ prices due to over supply. Neg did not show how additional funds to these farmers would be better for society than being handled by the government. The "No such thing as too much money" comment kind of hurt the neg.  
A Good enthusiastic round.

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	JamLog CT	POINTS	RANKS
2nd	Jesus Cardenas	28	4
1st	Sean Trinh	28.5	3

**NEGATIVE**

POS	Leland NW	POINTS	RANKS
2nd	Bang Nguyen	29	2
1st	Young Wu	29.1	1

The better debating was done by the AFF from Cardenas / Trinh  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

John Newitt

Yes Team was  
 The best speakers,  
 but AFF won  
 on argumentation

**COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:**

Very solid debate by both teams. Affirmative Team only has to show a net benefit and I believe they did.

The jobs argument goes to the abolition. The Neg Team did not disprove that jobs would, at a minimum be created in the manufacturing of the cars & the running of the trains. The Aff made the case that their plan would replace airplane travel. The Neg Team had a solid opening their to claim that jobs gained in high speed rail would be jobs lost in the aircraft industry and ~~we~~ could have made a case for no net job gain.

Interesting argument regarding increased ticket prices due to efficiency loss, but the wind drag argument did not seem compelling. Claims of ongoing losses as in China did not seem relevant to a plan that consisted of a one time investment of \$350 million. The observation by neg team that the \$350 million could be spent in other ways to create jobs was ~~not~~ unsupported & cancelled out by the aff observation that both could be done. ~~AFF was on top~~ CO2 was a push regarding increasing car efficiency.

# 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 TG	POINTS	RANKS
	Sindhoora Tallapragada	26.8	3
	Kshitij Gaur	26.9	2

## NEGATIVE

POS	BisO'D BL	POINTS	RANKS
	Olivia Bernadel-Huey	27	1
	Lily Zaballos	26	4

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

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

Signed: [Signature]

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- 1A Kshitij Durand Lira - Paki Afghan. USFG should significantly inc. border enforcement. [repetitive]  
 Advantages ① closer surveillance, decrease terrorism. ② drug trafficking (mostly past) ③ Reduce instability in region
- 1N Net benefit - value of resolution is defined by Aff. No funding. No timeframe.  
 olivia Troops trying to take home. Not increase. Crimes committed by armed forces. Doubtful value - worsens US/Afghan relation  
 Net benefits not possible b/c not provided solution. [Indignant, hysterical dislike of interpretation]
- 2A Value - more deaths in Durand Lira. US troops already on site. Topic list - NATO country discussing!  
 Aff. arguments - easily done by troops + infrastructure already. USFG = actor. Future deployment authorized by  
 improve of steps terrorism + crime from drug trafficking. Value!
- 2N No citations. Argument poor. No net value. Ineffective techniques to maintain.  
 Lily
- 3N olivia Aff plus description. action, it, timeline. Spent 1/2 time whining.
- 3A Kshitij Summary

I voted for the aff because they offered a more persuasive argument. I admired the neg's indignation and registered their dislike of the interpretation however I didn't feel convinced of their above argument because the aff convinced with new evidence + solid arguments to defend the border + its value.

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	GraBay HO	POINTS	RANKS
	Justin Habashi	28.5	1
	Nicolas Ontiveros	27.8	3

## NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga BK	POINTS	RANKS
	Rohan Bhardwaj	27.0	4
	Ajay Kirpekar	27.9	2

The better debating was done by the AFF from GraBay  
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 significantly increase investment in high speed rail.

IAPF

Pro: employment, should be FG,

- Plan
1. oversight in F&T dept. then transition to localities
  2. Funding - decommission V22 offroad 25B Jimmy Carter
  3. Transportation oversight - (respect)

NOTES

- Contra:
- ① HS rail undermined by localities. Economy hit, grab towns
  - ② Oil dependency on M.E. weaned off, environmental effects
  - ③ Decreased congestion / traffic. Open labor markets.

IN Value: recovery - less productivity, assumes \$ from DOD to DOT. de get rid of nervous pon. If distract  
 opportunity costs lost. Capabili - met driven decision

2A Value: societal welfare - alt forgot to mention. Economy with more productivity. ③ Necessity of HS rail. - No.

1. Market driven econ  
 2. Opportunity cost - assuming it isn't used well elsewhere

2A USFG can provide stimulus if + policy support.  
 Advantages: (job creation, oil) input - output will rise but not initial capital expenditure, control oil usage  
 labor mobility  
 Negative arguments: inc. income tax if job creation: Agree transport system with

2N Budget doesn't add up. Taxes disincentivize workers. Economics try less not helping any workers  
 Usage of HS rail train? Habitat - detrimental to environment. Transport already exists. Spend 25B

3N Summary - EC HSR bankrupt. Need oil to construct. Not popular to HSR, privs more popular.  
 No budget off. Inc. deficit, Search welfare ↓ value.

Site sources - Jimmy Carter, Gen Petraeus, Pres. Eisenhower Funding: Job stimuli - open labor markets not more hours.  
 reduction of oil

Despite the fact that they forgot to make clear the value of their argument, I voted for the AFF because their argument was better supported with citations (weaker connections using diplomats + military offer) but still evidence. The neg had excellent arguments but did not support and didn't offer an alternative solution to problem. Couldn't easily done more research + cited (example).

# 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	4
1	Chris Leboa	28	1

## NEGATIVE

POS	Leland WZ	POINTS	RANKS
2	Ashton Wu	27.5	3
1	Clifford Zhang	27.9	2

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

TOUGH CALLS - BOTH SIDES VERY CAPABLE WITH ADMIRABLE CLARITY AND FLOW

AFF - Could have made a stronger case FOR changing the status quo, BUT strong framework provided in the first speech held up.

GOOD ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF SMALL FARMERS AND ALLOWING FOR ~~COMPETITION~~ COMPETITION.

NEG - DID NOT PROVIDE AS COMPELLING RHETORIC TO SUPPORT YOUR OWN CONTENTIONS

HAD YOU ARGUED MORE STRONGLY FOR THE STATUS Q<sub>UO</sub>, RESULT COULD HAVE BEEN DIFFERENT.

A

FOLTZ,  
JANE

# 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	St. Mary RC	POINTS	RANKS
2	Aidan Reed	27.9	3
1	Adriana Contreras	27	4

## NEGATIVE

POS	Everg KP	POINTS	RANKS
2	Saifullah Khan	28	2
1	Harrison Park	28.1	1

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

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

Signed: Jane

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF TEAM: MORE EVIDENCE NEEDED TO SUPPORT YOUR CONTENTIONS - THIS WOULD HAVE STRENGTHENED YOUR ABILITY TO DEAL WITH OTHER ARGUMENTS AS THEY AROSE. YOU CONVINCED ME THAT THIS WAS A FACT DEBATE, BUT YOUR ARGUMENTS DID NOT GET STRONGER AS THE DEBATE PROGRESSED →

YOU BOTH HAVE A STRONG STYLE - EASY TO LISTEN TO AND FOLLOW

NEG TEAM

LOW TALKING DURING OPPONENT SPEECHES IS <sup>to partner</sup> BAD FORM.  
\* I APPRECIATED YOUR ARGUMENT THAT THE RESOLUTION WOULD POSSIBLY ↑ ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION.  
YOU ARE BOTH STRONG + NATURAL DEBATERS

> LAST SPEECH WAS YOUR STRONGEST, DESPITE THE POINT OF ORDER ISSUE, WHICH DID NOT AFFECT MY DECISION

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	NotDam ZP	POINTS	RANKS
2	Ciara Zambo	26	3
1	Michelle Pashby	24	4

## NEGATIVE

POS	JamLog MC	POINTS	RANKS
2	Mark Mabie	28	2
1	Ashley Chang	29	1

The better debating was done by the Nea from Jambo  
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 vote for the negative side because they fully supported all of their facts and ideas with sufficient evidence as the affirmative side did not demonstrate this. The negative side showed that with the way our economy is now, we would not benefit from the high speed rail until 2040, and by then our green technology with cars would be far more advanced, they also showed how the high speed rail only benefits a small portion of America, while it's a burden on all of America.

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	Everg MV	POINTS	RANKS
2	Krishna Madhusudan	24	3
1	Kaustubh Vinchure	24	4

## NEGATIVE

POS	SumPrep GS	POINTS	RANKS
1	Julia Gross	28	1
2	Alexander Stoddard	27	2

The better debating was done by the Neg from Sum Prep  
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 vote for the Neg side because they properly addressed the topic at hand. The Aff side did not address the topic at hand, they were discussing the Afghan/Pakistan border, while the topic was based more so on the US vs the Canadian and Mexican borders.

Room: Lucas 210  
Start: 4:00 pm  
Open Parliamentary

A

3

Stoddard-Phillips, Susan  
~~Mable, Ben~~  
Summit Prep

# 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	St. Mary RD	POINTS	RANKS
1	Roxanne Rodrigues	28	2
3	Serena Duggal	29	1

## NEGATIVE

POS	Wash DC	POINTS	RANKS
2	Rohit Dhar	27	3
4	Surya Chittadi	20	4

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

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

Signed: Em Stoddard-Phillips

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The resolution asked if a path to citizenship should be granted.  
Neg basically agreed by providing a counterplan (which is a path to citizenship).

Neg did have good points on breaking laws & draining of resources that could have been more fully developed.

Respectful debate - Thank you.

B

3

Stoddard-Phillips, Susan  
Mable, Ben  
Summit Prep

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

## AFFIRMATIVE

	POINTS	RANKS
<b>BisOD AP</b>		
Nicholas Accinelli	27	3
Nadia Perl	29	1

## NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS	RANKS
	<b>Milpitas ZO</b>		
2	Ahsan Zahid	28	2
4	Patrick O'Brien	26	4

The better debating was done by the Aff from Bis  
AFF / NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Sr Stoddard-Phillips

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Strength of argument, including state rights on legalization of marijuana, which was a key element of Neg's plan.

# 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	RANKS
PM	Caitlin Walsh	26	1
MG	Marco Zepeda	25	2

## NEGATIVE

POS	GraBay TA	POINTS	RANKS
LO	Michael Tom	21	4
MO	Gokul Asokan	21	3

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

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

Signed: Kathryn Bay

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff. laid out a clear argument based on environmental and economic benefits. Neg made an interesting attempt to prove its position by arguing against the larger U.S. gov and the democracy itself, but they didn't pull it off. In the process of trying to go outside the specific resolution, they glossed over their rebuttals to the affirmative's main 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.	Saratoga KP	POINTS	RANKS
PM	Ishaan Kolluri	25	2
MG	Neil Prasad	24	1

### NEGATIVE

POS	Mountview LH	POINTS	RANKS
MO	Daniel Leybzon	23	3
LO	Sam Holton	23	4

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

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

Signed: Kathy Ba

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative presented arguments in supporting resolution and Neg didn't quite understand them. They kept pressing on a single point about standardized tests, which was a minor part of Aff argument. The Neg also didn't understand that the standards don't dictate classes but provide a level of ed in core subjects that should be met. Neither side understood the difference b/w federal & national.

Lindsay Nancy  
Bishop O'Dawd

# 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	RANKS
1	Daniel Loran	29	2
2	Ian DeLisle	26	4

## NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga AC	POINTS	RANKS
2	Shauray Agrawal	28	3
1	Justin Chiang	29	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from Saratoga

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

Signed: Nancy L...

Great debate  
good job  
to all!

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Interesting approach with counter plan.  
 Neg won based on 1) presentation skills,  
 2) counter plan more effective, 3) effectively  
 identified holes in Aff Team plan (ie,  
 too flexible & vague.)

Issue of counter plan not being  
 mutually exclusive came up. I  
 felt the requirement for military  
 service did make the 2 plans  
 distinctively different.

Chiang given highest rank due to eloquent &  
 highly effective summation remarks.

# 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 HB	POINTS	RANKS
2	Aamir Hasnat	24/30	3
1	Ryan Boun	26/30	2

## NEGATIVE

POS	Leland DS	POINTS	RANKS
2	Sam Deghuee	20/30	4
1	Dominic Sonkowsky	30/30	1

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: [Signature] Karl Friedrich Borke

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg made stronger + more consistent case.

But Sam was a bit too aggressive/assertive. Did not

let off. ask 2nd or 3rd question.

Dominic flawless performance - excellent.  
most telling points.

case for neg was stronger on rights of populace -  
that does not have pr majority but for  
urban or rural + sparse pop. vs. major pop.  
+ swing state to call count.

Ryan a bit better organized/smooth than Aamir.

Everyone well spoken, articulate, good eye contact, audible

8:00 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	Team	POINTS	RANKS
	<b>Leland KT</b>		
1	Donghun Kang	28	1
2	Robert Tseng	28	2

## NEGATIVE

POS	Team	POINTS	RANKS
	<b>Everg AV</b>		
2	Ridhi Arun	27.5	4
1	Devangi Vivrekar	27.5	3

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

1A : - good speaking  
- good use of data and evidence

2A : - good speaking  
- good counter-arguments backed with data

1N : - good speaking  
- arguments based on technical aspects  
- could have used strong arguments such as impact on job, international competitiveness, etc.  
- argued by cell phone  
extended (small \$ impact)

2N : - good speaking  
- arguments based on technical aspects

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	Leland CY	POINTS	RANKS
2	Joseph Chen	29.5	1
1	Grant Yun	29	2

### NEGATIVE

POS	MSJ CH	POINTS	RANKS
1	Alice Cheng	27	3
2	Rebecca Hong	27	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:

USFG should significantly increase border patrol.

AFF

Neg

- Aff permed all of neg's advantages. Non-mutually exclusive CP.
- Fed govt. doesn't benefit from sales tax - yes.
- Add this impact of drugs - it decreases productivity and increases violent crime

- Never explained why CP would cost \$.
- Plan is feasible; as aff said, border control already in place.
- How does the CP solve for drug trafficking? Their plan polices it.

A

3

Yao, Sharon

De. Marty

# 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 CN	POINTS	RANKS
2	Dan Chiriaev	28	1
1	Larry Nguyen	27.5	2

## NEGATIVE

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

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

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

Signed: AM

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

USFG should provide a path to citizenship for illegal immigrants.

Aff

Neg

- Don't ask 3 part questions

- 2nd spkr: stop clicking your pen

- Take their questions please! I'm giving you a loss because you were rude.

- Are all illegals rapists and criminals?

- What happens to the kids who were born here and their parents are deported?

- The arg about drugs was non-topical- Aff said not ending border patrol.

B

Zhang Xuemai  
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	MountView LA	POINTS	RANKS
1	Leland Lee	28	3
2	Tom Ashkenazi	25	4

## NEGATIVE

POS	Poly DK	POINTS	RANKS
2	Nishanth Dara	28	1
1	Kartikeya Krishna	28	2

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: C. Camacho

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Leland: AFF It's highly unhealthy because it's  
Quotes been subsidized. LOL

Tom: "Many people eat food because it's subsidized"

↳ Learn how to handle therapy...

→ I Hate That I'm voting off this!!!  
NEG QUOTES

RFD: T-Shell Dropped. ... Justin Bieber: "Never say never"

CP  
↳ Extend

even though it was a really bad T-Shell lol...

Stupid silence is concert rule.

↳ Neg for knowing therapy though!

A

~~Zhang, Xuemei~~  
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 RT	POINTS	RANKS
1	Lakshmi Ramesh	27	3
2	Lucas Tung	27	4

## NEGATIVE

POS	BisO'D VY	POINTS	RANKS
1	Cate Vegis	29	2
2	Daylen Yang	30	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: [Signature]

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

PMC: Impact Stories need work  
Plan Structure was lacking  
Instead of using terms like  
"really bad" or "horrible" paint  
an impact story w/ concrete  
evidence.

NEG

Daylen! Major props  
for wearing the pants.  
Politics D.A. was kinda weak...  
Nat Security as well...

✓ Critiques Oral

RFD: Plan text was so unclear!!  
Default Neg!

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		POINTS	RANKS
	<del>Poly SS</del>		
	<del>AJ Singh</del>		
	<del>Pete Sanders</del>		

## NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS	RANKS
	Fox JaKi		
	Saksham Jain		
	Jaewon Kim		

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

# 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	RANKS
1	Nhada Ahmed	28.0	2
2	Kitty Lan	28.9	1

## NEGATIVE

POS	DiaVal WK	POINTS	RANKS
2	David Wang	27.5	4
4	Karthik Konath	27.6	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from NOT Dam AL  
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 team → \*Very clear in laying out the points and relate them to American values & actual facts. Team touched upon economic & social consequences of the issue very clearly.

\* I liked the presentation method used as they used good body language & moderate speech delivery speed.

\* One of the suggestions is to include the plan on how to stop further & stop immigration.

NEG team → \* Team provided good statistics & facts  
\* Used good parliamentary terminology & tried to relate the matter to the previous policies.

\* on the flip side the team should slow down speech delivery & state the main points very clearly. i.e explain points on which whole argument is based on.

\* Also the team did not address any issue of only children getting citizenship versus child & parent getting citizenship. there is social issue over here which was not addressed

\* Used loose links such as china/war/Japan war & economic impact on companies like google etc.  
\* Both participants were very fast & at time it was difficult to understand them. Need to improve speech delivery

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

## AFFIRMATIVE

*Not show*

POS	POINTS	RANKS
<b>NotDam CL</b>		
Christina Cherekdjian		
Surbhi Lohia		

## NEGATIVE

POS	POINTS	RANKS
<b>Saratoga AU</b>		
Elnaz Ahmadi		
Krishna Unadkat		

*lost notshowed up*

*won showed up*

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

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

Signed: *Walter Reth Justice Fresh Bork*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: Willaim L  
Start: ~~4:00 pm~~ 4:00 A  
Open Parliamentary

3

Schletzbaum, Jam

# 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	RANKS
	Leland KL		
	Karan Kolwalkar		
	Thomas Luh		

## NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS	RANKS
	Sumprep FC		
	Nick Fantuzzi		
	Kevin Cannon		

The better debating was done by the NEG from Sumprep FL  
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 did not show