

OPEN

PARLI

ROUND 4

Room: Eng 108
Start: 8:00 am
Open Parliamentary

B

4

Helle, Eric

Lindsay, Nancy
Bishop
O'Dowd

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 DC	POINTS	RANKS
1	Rohit Dhar	27	3
2	Surya Chittadi	25	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Poly SS	POINTS	RANKS
2	AJ Singh	29	1
1	Pete Sanders	28	2

The better debating was done by the Neg from Poly SS

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

Signed: Nancy Lindsay

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg team provided more cohesive arguments, had extremely effective delivery, better used statistics & common sense, and utilized P.O.I.s.

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	POINTS	RANKS
Leland DS		
Sam Deghuee	28	1
Dominic Sonkowsky	27	3

NEGATIVE

POS	POINTS	RANKS
BisOD AP		
Nicholas Accinelli	27	2
Nadia Perl	26	4

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: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The Prime minister opened up with a clear concise argument and contentions. Leader of the opposition argued well some points, 2 contentions, "Artificial sweeteners are worse" and "unconstitutionality" became important to debate. The argument became whether Artificial sweeteners are sugars, and much of the negative case depended on this. Also needed strong argument for constitutionality. Member of Govt. Constructive argued Artificial sweeteners are sugars, by chemical definition. ~~He~~ He supported case well and added fact that 65% of Canadians in favor of tax, which was never refuted or argued. Member of Opposition argued again artificial sweetener issue, argued benefit programs extraneous stuck to previous arguments.

↓

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

RUDGE AH

RUDGE AH

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Sumprep FC	POINTS	RANKS
1	Nick Fantuzzi	17	4
2	Kevin Cannon	16	3

NEGATIVE

POS	MountView EA	POINTS	RANKS
1	Kyle Evans	17	2
2	Mohan Avula	18	1

The better debating was done by the neg from MV 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:

neg. attacked opponents points effectively
weak CP - follow through with it if there was potential
aff strong intro points - needed more strength consider backup
the cost-benefit analysis could have sequenced into something bigger.

A

4

Chow, Stephen

Delisle, Kristine-Summit

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 WZ	POINTS	RANKS
PM	Ashton Wu	28	1 *
M	Clifford Zhang	27	2 *

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga AU	POINTS	RANKS
L	Elnaz Ahmadi	26	3 *
M	Krishna Unadkat	25	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: Kristine Delisle

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

While neither side had tangible facts supporting that increased taxes OR education are demonstrated to reduce consumption, the judge is more persuaded that the tax would accomplish the government's stated objectives as presented.

The government presenters were more polished and organized in presenting their position. When the opposition entertained the one question it allowed, the response was actually effective. (might consider taking more).

The government was more effective at rebutting opposition points.

The opposition needed to work on time mgmt as not all government points were addressed timely.

* Please note: the judge is not certain that the roles are assigned to the appropriate student. Verify if critical

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 MC	POINTS	RANKS
	Mark Mabie	27	2
	Ashley Chang	26	3

NEGATIVE

POS	St. Mary RD	POINTS	RANKS
	Roxanne Rodrigues	27	1
	Serena Duggal	26	4

The better debating was done by the Affirmative from JamLog
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:

Affirmative presented a well thought-out, well reasoned, and well supported plan. Negative presented a good counterplan, however there was no data to support their main argument, just an assumption that supplies are old. Prop 20 was mentioned by name, but no information about how it would help CSU's specifically was given.

As far as speaking skills, all debaters did well. Please keep in mind, however, that speaking louder doesn't make your argument more effective - it can actually seem hostile at times and undermine your effectiveness. Also, all debaters need to be aware of rules reprotected times.

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 GZ	POINTS	RANKS
<i>1</i>	Brighu Gollabinnie	<i>29</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>2</i>	Kenny Zhang	<i>28</i>	<i>4</i>

NEGATIVE

POS	NotDam AL	POINTS	RANKS
<i>1</i>	Nhada Ahmed	<i>28</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>2</i>	Kitty Lan	<i>29</i>	<i>1</i>

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: *(points were tied.)*

Signed: *Nancy Lued*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Teams very well matched, provided good analysis & were well spoken. Both used good data to back up cases. Aff team did better job outlining points & arguing net benefits overall. Aff pointed out the most convincing flaws in the Neg team case - status quo & lack of any counter proposal didn't show how any real net benefits would come to CA public.

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	30	2
2	Gokul Asokan	30	1

NEGATIVE

POS	NotDam ZP	POINTS	RANKS
1	Ciara Zambo	27	3
2	Michelle Pashby	26.5	4

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

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

Signed: Joseph Nguyen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- 1. no explanation of those currently on death row
 - 1. prop 34 covers
 - 2. ϕ impact
 - OK !!
- 2. combining lifers w/ ppl convicted of premeditated murder
 - 1. rest actually higher
 - 1. ϕ fair to give some sentence
 - 2. ϕ say where would put them
- 1. sets example death is a strong disincentive
 - 1. TX + OK have highest exec. rate & homicide
 - 1. instills fear
 - 2. symb import to CA
- 2. immoral to provide life in prison prison life is comfortable
 - 1. contradicts first points
 - 2. detrit studies flawed b/c ϕ acct for social ret
 - 3. ϕ even executed
 - 4. no one kills to get into prison. they steal.
 - 1. shows ppl prefer prison to poverty

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	RANKS
2	Rohan Grover	29.5	1
1	Mayank Srivastava	29	2

NEGATIVE

POS	BisO'D AL	POINTS	RANKS
2	Justin Adsuaara	28.5	3
1	Chris Leboa	28	4

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

contextually defined
 policy rd → use a plan
 NB
 P1 10¢ tax on ea. bag
 immediately
 Normal means

No agent of action

Platted thru normal means

point specify normal means

No actor means no action

They haven't specified an agent

1. Env
 12m plastic bags used/yr
 2% recycled
 kill birds, marine life
 12m barrel of oil
 98% Ireland & 90%
 oil prices &
 prevent animal death

More inclined to make paper bags → other poll. air poll
 dir. of EPA → water is a more precious resc. more animals hurt

2. No link to how it kills
3. 12m less than what US uses in a day
4. unfair burden on poor of Am who take public trans to store

1. Paper bags exist now, aff & one comp of prob.
2. ppl will use reusable bags
3. SJ banned plastic, paper bags & 1
4. animals cannot choke on paper bags

1. so it concedes that it ↓ use of bags
2. & a relevant issue, will bring a causable

1. paper, canvass outweighs - air + water poll.
2. You can choke on paper

1. Rev wont do anyth. while lost income is more problem.

2. Revenue
 minimal tax leads to high revenue
 will help in CA

1. No proof
2. All kinds of harms to babies

1. Real risk. so ↓ amnt & baby deaths

1. so small

1. Finan. Det
 superbags cost 5x
 reduces consumption

1. Ireland as counter-ex
2. reusing bags gen rev.

1. less consumption

2. & help env
 11m trees a year

1. Ireland ex.

1. sec. trees bad

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	Wash ST	POINTS	RANKS
1	Manveer Singh	28	1
2	Abhinav Tripathy	25	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Prospect CN	POINTS	RANKS
1	Dan Chiriaev	26	3
2	Larry Nguyen	27	2

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

"CA should repeal the death penalty"

Both teams showed good clash + good countering to one another. Be wary of making subjective arguments - such as death penalty is inherently moral/immoral, or the death penalty gives more/less closure to victims' families. ans there isn't empirical evidence to back these up with empirical evidence. Both sides did a good job of finding hard financial data, but more empirical evidence on other topics, such as deterrence, rehabilitation (which is not the same thing as closure, a mistake both aff and 2nd neg made), etc.

Neg misunderstood did not address rehab contention - so aff wins on flow.

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	Milpitas ZO	POINTS	RANKS
1	Ahsan Zahid	27	3
2	Patrick O'Brien	26	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Everg TG	POINTS	RANKS
2	Sindhoora Tallapragada	28	2
1	Kshitij Gaur	28	1

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: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

"CA should implement a tax on plastic bags"

Both teams showed a strong understanding of the issue, good, well-researched and well-supported arguments, and excellent clash on both sides. In the final speech, aff dropped the topicality argument that a tax cannot be printed off-sale as a 600% increase on \$0 is still \$0, and failed to draw a concrete net detriment to un-American-ness. Neg wins on the flow.

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	Leland NW	POINTS	RANKS
	Bang Nguyen	23	4
	Young Wu	25	2

NEGATIVE

POS	BisO'D WZ	POINTS	RANKS
	Caitlin Walsh	24	3
	Marco Zepeda	25	1

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both sides made very rational arguments. However, the arguments by Aff. were not sufficiently compelling to justify a tax. Each of the debaters ~~were to work~~ would be better if they slowed down and spoke in a normal tone of voice. Some of the speeches seemed too rushed, which is understandable given the time limits. However, it's better to make fewer points that are better understood, than more points that are difficult to keep track of.

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
Lynbrook JY		
Sujeeth Jinesh	27	3
Cameron Yang	22	4

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS	RANKS
	Leland KT		
	Donghun Kang	29	1
	Robert Tseng	28	2

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: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Members of winning team were better speakers.
 Their arguments were slightly better. However,
 the losing team did a good job with what they
 had to work with. Nobody spoke too fast.
 Everyone finished within allotted time or less

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
MG	Shauray Agrawal	28.1	2
PM	Justin Chiang	29.0	1

NEGATIVE

POS	St. Mary RC	POINTS	RANKS
MO	Aidan Reed	23.8	4
LO	Adriana Contreras	23.7	3

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

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

Signed: Aaron Luoma

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: overall excellent job I earn of first too many flaws outside your specific examples given such as the const violation

LO: Although you had some nice points, overall it looks like you dropped ~~the~~ two of them concerning which had terrible impact the results of this debate

MO: After the notification of dropped contentions the only real argument was determined, addressing the economic issues could have greatly helped

Aff has won this round because they define their points with ease and effectively set up their framework

A

4

Jin, Shu

Aaron Lindsay
Cal
Lutheran

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

AFFIRMATIVE

MSJ CH	POINTS	RANKS
Alice Cheng	27.1	2
Rebecca Hong	26.5	3

NEGATIVE

POS	NotDam BD	POINTS	RANKS
MO	Shruthi Basireddy	26.3	4
LO	Meredith Duflock	27.5	1

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

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

Signed: Aaron Lindsay

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both sides: good job with questions but they needed to dive deeper a bit more. Also link the impacts back to the standard, both sides were very organized.

Affirmative: Although you set up good contentions that showed that both health and the economy will be affected, you needed to define the words of the debate clearly. Good job refuting most of their points, you missed a few but were ultimately able to provide some offense by asking multiple questions. Address all the points.

Negative: Good job providing definitions and a career plan, but again I feel your contentions lacked a link to the standard. Make sure to always link things together.

Overall: I felt the debate started to repeat itself after a while, "can you find" - "or not" as I mentioned earlier. Why is this bad, be more concise and link it back to our value. Good job refuting and pointing out dropped points though.

Notes: Don't ask questions in protest of the

Overall the decision for this debate was made because I feel that the debate was not well defined, many good points were made from both sides, but it was ultimately the responsibility of the Aff to define the value which was not done very well.

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 NF	POINTS	RANKS
	Yari Nieves-Rivera	27.7	2
	Josue Flores	27	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Everg MV	POINTS	RANKS
	Krishna Madhusudan	27.5	3
	Kaustubh Vinchure	28.1	1

The better debating was done by the Neg from Madhusudan/Vinchure
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed:  Luke DeWitt

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

A solid round by both Teams. The first Affirmative speaker to a good job at laying out their plan in the first speech and the 2nd Aff supported that plan well but missed some opportunities to respond points made by the first Neg speaker. 2nd Neg speaker made a very incisive observation in noting that the Aff plan benefits was contradictory in that as bag usage declined so would revenues available to support government expenditures for the economy.

The debate hinged on two points. Environmental impact + Economic impacts. Neg Team tried to introduce something about supermajorities, voting + democracy but the arguments were too muddy to follow. Negation counter-plans wins on environmental impact due to CO2, bag vs .3% Tax per bag. Economic arguments were less clear. Aff argument about hiring teachers, etc was good but countered by Neg observation that tax would reduce consumer spending. Neg missed opportunity to use the bag making (cloth + plastic) as argument in their favor. Neg claimed the gain by banning bags. Aff could have claimed the same employment gain to occur over their five year plan. Neg was correct that topicality argument was late gave economic argument to Neg.

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	RANKS
	David Wang	28	1
	Karthik Konath	27.7	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Everg CT	POINTS	RANKS
	Namrata Challa	27.5	3
	Shivani Thombare	27	4

The better debating was done by the Neg from Challa / Thombare
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Excellent Round Good Engagement on both sides. Aff Team won on all key points except the fundamental issue of constitutionality.

The first affirmative speaker was particularly strong in terms of presentation, organization and quality. The Teams arguments were well constructed and well supported but ultimately fundamentally weak. All the positive elements of their plan rested essentially on whether the death penalty was constitutional. I might have given them the round if they had just ~~not~~ relied on the Affirmative Teams presumed power of fiat regarding legislation, but instead they ~~per~~ pursued validity to show the death penalty was unconstitutional.

The negative Team was somewhat weaker in their overall presentation skills but their argument that prop 34 was ~~by~~ ~~not~~ rejected by the voters was compelling, particularly when they contrasted their voter action with the Aff Teams claim that supporting the constitution and government legitimacy were key imperatives.

The repeated observations about the death penalty being unconstitutional under international law, a supreme court quote and that politicians should not be alone allowed to have a death penalty whose not persuasive in light of the reality that the death penalty is indeed in place.

A caution to the Affirmative Team to avoid appearing condescending to their opponents and the Neg Team to follow more closely the rules for interrupting speeches.

A

4

Deadwiler, Brand

McBrew, Bill Jesuit Sacramento

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

3. CA should implement a tax on plastic bags.

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	27	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Everg HB	POINTS	RANKS
2	Aamir Hasnat	28	2
1	Ryan Boun	26	4

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:

AFF (Khosla/Hao)
Winner

Positive: AFF was able maintain logic/evidence flow throughout that CA should implement a tax on plastic bags. Benefits (1) Reduce use of PB helps environment & people; (2) helps address CA budget by positively impacting debt). Well done staying on the topic; should tax PB's. ~~They~~ Demonstrate great balance to stay w/ contentions while also rebutting Neg in time given.

Neg (Hasnat/Boun)

Positive: Creative thought process (logic) with counterplans to eliminate plastic bags supported by strong evidence (SF). Excellent use of evidence to support a different & hot topic. Impress: Speak rebuttal time continuously to argue counterplan without answering me why CA should not implement a tax on plastic bags.

AFF POS #1 (Khosla)

Positive: Strong delivery: voice, passion in tone, not reading from notes too much. Clear definitions, criterion, contentions (PB's harm env; PB's harm humans; Tax on PB's help CA budget). Well done clarifying position: Implementing tax will help env, human, and debt reduction. Show that CA should implement.
Impress: make eye contact w/ judge more; your evidence came across heard on holistic rather than scores.

Neg POS #2 (Hasnat)

Positive: Of the 4 speakers, Aamir came across the most "comfortable" throughout his entire 7 minutes: good voice, eye contact, voice volume. Well done carrying positive counterplan. Impress: Could not convince me that CA's ~~argument~~ do not want higher taxes = little evidence (you were telling, but not showing me how other CA's disagree)

Over →

B

McGrew, Bill Jesuit Sacramento

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

#1: CA should increase the sin tax on alcohol.

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

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Everg AV	POINTS	RANKS
2	Ridhi Arun	221	2
1	Devangi Vivrekar	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Sumprep LD	POINTS	RANKS
1	Daniel Loran	27	3
2	Ian DeLisle	24	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Everg AV
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 (Vivrekar/Arun): Positives: "Team" came across very well prepared and complemented each other carrying flow of argument (Increase sin tax = deters alcohol consumption + possibly impacts education). Very strong evidence (Belief/sources) to support logic - CLEAR WARRANTS Delivery + (voice + eye contact) projected confidence. Clear description of how contributions will/can result in multiple impacts.

Improve: Time management = the additional time taken resulting in judge stopping is a ~~neg~~ negative. Elevated focus of refutation/contribution on U.S. economy a low times = reminder to keep it to topic (CA).


Neg (Loran/Delisle): Positives: Impressive attempt to argue case with 6 contributions = I was really impressed that you relatively effectively came at the topic in six different ways. You elevated right at the start that "status quo" is your ideal as more beneficial than ~~not~~ increasing tax = I had this point as a great positive: but did not see Neg tell me what and how CA status quo outweighs net benefits of AFF contribution. ~~Benefits~~

Improve: Downside to having so many contributions is that it leaves very little time to refute AFF contributions = weakness. Also, consider reducing # of contributions to your top 2 or 3 and then build out with evidence/logic/impact.

AFF 2 (Vivrekar) Positive: Very polished framework = clear & simple; Delivery comes across as a subject matter expert. Best use of evidence/sourcing of all four speakers. Great example of how 2 contributions supported by logic/evidence can carry. Eye contact/voice solid.

Improve: Asked if Neg had any questions within first minute = suggest not opening the door to risk you losing time. Also no questions in 1st or last minute.

Over ->



Preliminary

Round 4	Room 20138
Aff. Team	Neg. Team
VS.	
Judge Kathy Kunes	

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Low pt
win ✓

Name 1A Vignesh Muruganathan		SPEAKER RANK Best.....Last 1 2 3 4		Name 1N Ishwari Ramesh		SPEAKER RANK Best.....Last 1 2 3 4	
SPEAKER POINTS Persuasiveness 1 2 3 4 5 Organization 1 2 3 4 5 Delivery 1 2 3 4 5 Evidence 1 2 3 4 5 Cross-Examination 1 2 3 4 5 Refutation 1 2 3 4 5		Poor.....Excellent TOTAL 22		SPEAKER POINTS Persuasiveness 1 2 3 4 5 Organization 1 2 3 4 5 Delivery 1 2 3 4 5 Evidence 1 2 3 4 5 Cross-Examination 1 2 3 4 5 Refutation 1 2 3 4 5		Poor.....Excellent TOTAL 23	
Comments:				Comments:			
Name 2A Lemar Karim		SPEAKER RANK Best.....Last 1 2 3 4		Name 2N Lucas Tung		SPEAKER RANK Best.....Last 1 2 3 4	
SPEAKER POINTS Persuasiveness 1 2 3 4 5 Organization 1 2 3 4 5 Delivery 1 2 3 4 5 Evidence 1 2 3 4 5 Cross-Examination 1 2 3 4 5 Refutation 1 2 3 4 5		Poor.....Excellent TOTAL 21		SPEAKER POINTS Persuasiveness 1 2 3 4 5 Organization 1 2 3 4 5 Delivery 1 2 3 4 5 Evidence 1 2 3 4 5 Cross-Examination 1 2 3 4 5 Refutation 1 2 3 4 5		Poor.....Excellent TOTAL 25	
Comments:				Comments:			
Affirmative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		I voted for the: Double Loss <input type="checkbox"/>		Negative <input type="checkbox"/>			

Reason For Decision:

Aff argued that Neg plan was not a change from status quo. Aff contured by claiming DNA evidence would erase all ambiguity, But Neg proved with Texas example that 100% Ambiguity was impossible. Slim victory, very close round.

Date 11-19 Judge Signature [Signature] Kunes

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
2	Nishanth Dara (2nd)	27.3	4
1	Kartikeya Krishna (1st)	28.2	2

NEGATIVE

POS	BisO'D RC	POINTS	RANKS
2	Tim Ring (2nd)	27.5	3
1	Jordan Crosby (1st)	28.5	1

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

relatively the NEG team's argument is more organized.

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	Everg KP	POINTS	RANKS
	Saifullah Khan (1st)	27.5	1
	Harrison Park (2nd)	27.1	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Lynbrook SV	POINTS	RANKS
1	Sohil Sathe (1st)	27.4	2
4	Anirudh Velamuri (2nd)	27.3	3

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams are good. But the neg team's argument is more consistent.

B

SUDHIR THOMBARE

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

EVHS

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
MA	Vincent Chiu	27	2
PM	Jason Han	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga KP	POINTS	RANKS
LO	Ishaan Kolluri	26	3
MO	Neil Prasad	26	4

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: Sudhir Thombare (SUDHIR THOMBARE)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- AFF defended their plan well & correctly pointed out flaws in NEG argument ~~about socioeconomically~~ & proved in fact NEG is actually support AFF.

PMC

- Prohibit not benefit
- Mortality rate - alcohol abuse
- crime rate - alcohol abuse
- revenue for state - people support & in sin tax than income tax.
- did not take question

LOC

- probably people won't even see it as sin tax is not separate
- revenue can ^{even} decreas
- unfair to poor.
- business want fall
- no real revenue.
- took question

MGC

- ~~tax~~
- increase price does have impact.
- drunk driving argument not opposed
- best way to increase revenue as it is least opposition
- ~~WA~~ much lower in taxy alcohol
- rate low beca lobbying

MOC

- people will buy
- Cartoon wine industry will be lost
- hurts low middle class
- political is ready will not be passed

LOR

- drinking their troubles away

PMR

- fonti more arts poor people
- miller class build
- whether or not it can pass that is not question

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

SUDHIR
 THOMBARE
 EVHS

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Saratoga BK	POINTS	RANKS
PM	Rohan Bhardwaj	27	3
MG	Ajay Kirpekar	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Wash AA	POINTS	RANKS
LO	Jamie Avery	28	2
MO	Stephanie Andrade	25	4

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

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

Signed: Sudhir Thombare

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~AFF~~ NEG was able to convince that this debate should be policy debate but then they could not lay down the reasoning why as a policy NEG was winning. AFF pointed out flaws in

<p>PM C</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - promote morally/societal welfare - cover cost of damage - find to come change. - took questions - innum renew - boost economy - at end quit - govt. obligation to protect citizen. <p>Same argument twice.</p>	<p>LOC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - asked question - not value date - interfere with insurance interference - police - only some people are drunk - consuming not immoral. - other causes for accidents. - #1 producer CA so CA economy depends on alcohol - Good 	<p>MGC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - only taking about alcohol - we are in deficit - not taking question - good gestures 	<p>MOC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - money can't be promised for all causes. - pastor not same as alcoholic - used some statistics. 	<p>LOR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - less people buying product bad for economy. - stereotyping is voting issue. 	<p>PMR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - value? can it be in this part debate? - how to lose weight? - we are care of alcohol
---	--	---	---	---	---

Room: Loyola 134
Start: 8:00 am
Open Parliamentary

CA should repeal the death Penalty
4

Eiserloh, A.J

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 RY	POINTS	RANKS
2	Sudeep Raj	28	4
1	Jerry Yang	28	3

NEGATIVE

POS	NotDam CK	POINTS	RANKS
1	Aislinn Foltz-Colhour	30	1
2	Allie Kerkhoff	28	3

The better debating was done by the Neg from Not Dam CK
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Mom

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted neg because Neg proved any money saved would be ^{too} insignificant to make a large enough advantage to outweigh the ~~other~~ arguments. Neg also showed the 5% innocents is an issue with the justice system, not the death penalty & used Aff analysis of life in prison determinant to show innocent people will still be unjustly placed under severe punishment in some rare cases. Aff never responded to the Neg argument about the death penalty being about distinction of punishment ^{between degree of crimes,} rather than just a deterrent. On the value of societal welfare, closure & feeling of safety (explicitly agreed to by Aff) outweigh 5% innocents argument because innocents will still be punished and Aff only said feeling safe is irrelevant to justice, without address neg's impacts to societal welfare. I & Aff ^{wants a criterion} ~~is~~ not have focused on criterion of ~~the~~

Room: Loyola 134
Start: 8:00 am
Open, Parliamentary

CA should tax plastic bags
4
Eiserloh, A.J

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	26	4
2	Bixby Ponteri	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Prospect SL	POINTS	RANKS
1	Krishnan Srinivasan	29	1
2	Aaron Latta	27	3

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

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

Signed: MORR

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted on the fact that the ^{Aff's} harms were centered around the environmental impact of the creation and use of plastic bags, ~~and~~ which the neg counter plan would solve more completely. The revenue from the tax being used for clean energy was less focused on and the neg arguments about some "clean energy" having the environmental ^{issues} about this being an extra topical mandate of the Aff Plan were both unresponded to.

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 GS	POINTS	RANKS
1	Julia Gross	26	4
3	Alexander Stoddard	27	2

NEGATIVE

POS	MountView LA	POINTS	RANKS
2	Leland Lee	27.5	1
4	Tom Ashkenazi	26.5	3

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

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

Signed: C. DeWitt

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Julia: Keep your eye on the judge. your 2nd contention needs more strengthening. I found it very weak.

Alex: Good speaker, but work on your flow. Personally thought you should have been 1st speaker.

Leland: Good speaker, delivery can use some improvement.

Tom: Don't sway side to side a lot. work on your speech but overall, good job reiterating your points.

Reason for decision: NEG won, they provided a framework and showed the net benefits. However, AFF could have won by going with a values case. they did not emphasize on 3 of their contentions and many stuck w/ 2.

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	28	2
3	Lily Zaballos	27	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga BO	POINTS	RANKS
4	Kushol Bhattacharjee	27	3
2	Michael Ong	28	1

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: Chunra

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Olivia: you are a good speaker. would have liked to see a little more about your second contention.

Kushol: Good speaker! Good job going over case and strengthening it.

Lily: Slow down abit. If you are going to speak fast, speak clearly. work on flow.

Michael: Good speaker, good job refuting. work on your flow.

Reason for Decision: It was a close case! However NEG won. Showed more reason why they should win.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic "CA should levy a tax on beverages with sugar added during manufacture"

AFFIRMATIVE

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

NEGATIVE

POS	JamLog CT	POINTS	RANKS
2	Jesus Cardenas	29	3
1	Sean Trinh	26	2

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

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

Signed: Susannah Schwing

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: AFF

(1) Saksham was confident, eye contact, speak with gesture and memorized with a good speech and very will memorizing very will constructive.

Also (2) Jaewon, will speaking, confident eye contact, consistent, did very well job

Both have an efforts in to the subject with a quality and ability

Both accomplished the task very good and had a clear and loud voice.

(1) Sean, ^{neg} was not very confident, you need to be more in that, and you need to give more attention of what the other team saying - special in remembering was Norway or Denmark, then catch it after all.

he was a good speaker, need more organiz your point. good rebuttal with ability to ask question and stay in task.

(2) Se sus, very confident, constructive with attention and efforts.

consistent in the subject. good speech and did well. he accomplished the task well, clear and loud voice.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic "CA should repeal the death penalty."

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	BisO'D VY	POINTS	RANKS
1	Cate Vegis	28 27	2 3
2	Daylen Yang	27	4

NEGATIVE

POS	GraBay HO	POINTS	RANKS
1	Justin Habashi	29	1
2	Nicolas Ontiveros	27 28	2

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

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

Signed: Susannah Bond

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

(1) Cate, confident, but needs to be more memorized to subject, instead of looking down a lot - good points and job, try more memorizing - also try to listen more to your other side than talking, will give more quality in memorizing.

You are good speech, consistent, clear and loud voice, but you need more eye contact

(2) Daylen confident, but quite, you need to be more loud confident - also listen more to your other side than talking will help. Persuasive and ability with quality, was part of you. used sources, this was good.

You need to work more in aggressive persuasive. you are persuasive any way

Neg

(1) Justin, there is no one perfect, but you were one, very confident, eye contact at all times, stand straight, clear, loud voice with accomplishing your point. give time at all times to the other side to ask questions, very respectful of that. good and consistent speech, just stay the way you are and improve at the same way.

(2) Nicolas, confident, eye contact, fast and loud, did well in that, but you need more to slow down when you talk, and do not go over time long - also give chance to your friends in the other side to ask Q, it is always respectful to them, and look good on you. your quality is very good