

OPEN
PARLI
ROUND 5

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 Max = 30	RANKS
1	Mario Khosla	26	4
2	Allen Hao	26	3

NEGATIVE

POS	BisO'D VY	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Cate Vegis	28	2
2	Daylen Yang	29	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: MUK

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff C₁ - Aff, tax break will help small business more than status quo even with innovation issues.

Aff C₂ - Aff, more money = more investment by small businesses

Aff C₃ - Aff, more capital for small business → more start-ups → more jobs.

Top - Neg, slight neg win on analysis of Aff only effecting one corporate tax bracket, I would've been fine with that if Aff had make that clear in the 1AC & had specified which bracket.

Moving target - Neg, Aff should've defined small businesses to begin with when Neg asked and Aff answered with "300 employees or less" that became the definition. If aff thought it was okay to not define what/who they're effecting, don't blame neg for making you define it on the fly. → Neg - big revenue w/ small employee base or vice versa is creating new loopholes.

Neg C_{1/2} - wash, Aff proved they're tax break was not big enough to cause these issues. Neg was running them against a more specific plan, which wasn't in this round.

sol/v - Neg, 96-98% of small businesses file as individuals & Aff doesn't help them. (Aff ex: take tax code)

CP₁ - Aff, Permissible

CP₂ - Aff, I buy that it'd be very hard to implement. Neg never really responded to this.

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	Lynbrook SV	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Sohil Sathe	30	1
1	Anirudh Velamuri	29	2

NEGATIVE

POS	JamLog CT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Jesus Cardenas	28	3
1	Sean Trinh	27	4

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

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

Signed: Mew

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted Aff because besides the contentions dealing with GDP, the entire Neg case and all Neg responses to Aff arguments were based on the idea that Bush tax cuts only apply to the rich... which is blatantly false. Neg, IDK where you got IRS evidence saying only ppl making over 200k get breaks but it's obviously not true. ^{Do some research before assuming} Bush tax cuts effect ^{250k} 6 separate tax brackets. The lowest of which is ppl making ^{250k} 35k, who will see their rates ^{rise} from 10% - 15% when the tax cuts expire. Thanks Aff for holding neg accountable on ^{this} their numerous assumptions about the economy & Bush tax cuts. ~~AS~~ AS to the GDP arguments, Aff showed external factors, like the wars & housing crash & Job outsourcing were the primary factors in GDP ~~and~~ ^{neg admitted in last two speeches} and Aff said in IAC to discount all arguments linking external factors to tax cuts. ^{there were many factors} On Net Benefits I vote Aff for the ^{*Neg- you were 2 minutes} above reasons but mainly because Aff's 3rd ^{the talking} from a forfeit, you were 22 ^{min late & Aff was} 4th arguments about empowering people economically and ⁱⁿ the room over 15 min before ^{that only the rich get breaks} educationwise. Neg's only response was a flawed assumption. You. Please be on time.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

AFFIRMATIVE


POS	BisO'D WZ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Caitlin Walsh	28	2
2	Marco Zepeda	28.5	1

NEGATIVE

POS	NotDam AL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Nhada Ahmed	27	4
1	Kitty Lan	27.5	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from BisO'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:

increase taxes after TC expire on earners making more than 250k

we get the benefits after 6 mo.

1. Prosperity
 census | small biz growth higher before bush TC
 wealth polarization

1. no link
 2. many small biz in 250k income, which taxes them in CP

extend thru resp.

2. social welfare
 reach some equil. if TC exp

1. Loopholes cause prb., and gov solves better

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	JamLog RT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Lakshmi Ramesh	28	4
2	Lucas Tung	28	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Everg KP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Saifullah Khan	29	2
1	Harrison Park	29	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: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

"Federal Reserve should increase interest rates"

Both sides showed good logical reasoning, strong use of empirical evidence, and good clash. Aff failed to address Neg's trickle-down investment theory, which means Neg's arguments about higher interest rates leading to more defaulting + less investment carry. Neg was able to provide the more compelling argument.

Jorgesen, 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	Everg AV	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Ridhi Arun	27	1
1	Devangi Vivrekar	27	2

NEGATIVE

POS	St. Mary RD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Roxanne Rodrigues	23	4
2	Serena Duggal	25	3

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: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

"USFG should significantly reduce corporate tax"

Both sides had good analysis and evidence. 1st ^{Neg} ~~aff~~ speaker completely dropped ^{Aff's} ~~neg's~~ case. It was picked up for 2nd neg speech + rebuttal, but there was little clash and not much direct answer to aff's case, therefore Aff wins.

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 Max = 30	RANKS
2	Vincent Chiu	26	2
1	Jason Han	25	4

NEGATIVE

POS	BisOD AP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Nicholas Accinelli	26	3
1	Nadia Perl	27	1

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

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

aff: lacked a strong initial argument & neg tackled it. hard
 ↳ needs better frame w/ neg → neg practically defined it themselves
 ↳ services or debt
 both: no measurable or predictable benefit (aff), but ~~credibility~~
 vs
 stay arguments & lack of replacement

Botsch Mubunny Sarah

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

USPB should significantly raised the capital gains tax.

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 Max = 30	RANKS
	Justin Adsuaara	28	1
	Chris Leboa	27	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga BK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Rohan Bhardwaj	27	3
	Ajay Kirpekar	27	4

The better debating was done by the ARK from BODAL
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 decision comes down primarily to Gov doing a much better job explaining why current system of capital gains tax actually hurts both actual economy through de-incentivizing creation of new business (ie you are taxed more at corporate rate / indiv rate than capital gains so why would you want to start business) and at a social level (increased resentment among lower classes). Off actually helped Gov when they brought up the Kennedy example, and they failed to address the point that the majority of those who rely on CG as the majority of their tax burden are the super rich who did not earn any of their wealth, it was gained through inheritance. Also Goldman Sachs was probably not the best example to use. The Fed lowering interest rates didn't cause the housing crash, huge banks packaging

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

USFB should significantly reduce the corporate tax

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	MountView EA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Kyle Evans	28	1
2	Mohan Avula	27	3

NEGATIVE

POS	BisO'D BL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Olivia Bernadel-Huey	27	2
2	Lily Zaballos	26	4

The better debating was done by the OPP from MA-New 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:

The decision ultimately came down to who showed me the most benefits. Neg failed to really link DTAs w/ reduced corporate tax rates. Wouldn't companies be able to make up difference in their low tax rates? There was just a way for comp to make up for having a higher tax rate so lowering rate would solve.

OPP needs to use a proper shell to win T. It was not made a-priori, so I correct in round as a whole. I do see some ground for it being extra topical, so I did lower my assessment of part 2 of plan, but opp spent too much time inefficiently explaining abuse and not addressing key evidence in CO's main cont (1 & 2) that left hole in round.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic -USFG should allow the military sequester to occur

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	NotDam CK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Aislinn Foltz-Colhour	27	2
3	Allie Kerkhoff	25	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Fox JaKi	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Saksham Jain	26	3
2	Jaewon Kim	28	1

The better debating was done by the Neg from Fox
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:

Foltz-Colhour
clearly explains contentions, v. logical presentation

Kim
speaks w/ energy, ~~at~~ good rebuttals strong presentation

Kerkhoff
make good pts but presentation could be more crisp, at times hard to follow argument.

Jain
good supplemental pt. to Kim's v. good arguments.

Neg made stronger arguments regarding min. impact of sequestration on ~~the~~ debt, on 2m. job loss. ~~the~~ Neg more persuasive in arguing that even if cut is a good thing, there are smarter ways to plan a cut than across the board.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL (Summit Prep)

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic - ~~Feb~~ Fed Reserve should increase interest rates.

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	BisO'D RC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
3	Tim Ring	28 28	2
1	Jordan Crosby	26 29	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Everg TG	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Sindhoora Tallapragada	27	27 ³
2	Kshitij Gaur	28	28 ¹

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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Crosby
clear speech, but logical link not as clear. Final speech v. good.

Ring
clear, confident speech..

Gaur
clearly outline the issue at start good evid support, but contentions not as clearly articulated

Tallapragada
confident speech, ~~but~~, good eye contact.

Neg was unpersuasive in its argument that higher interest rate decreases inflation while lower rate increases inflation and that how higher inflation is good for the economy. Both teams presented confusing cause-and-effect arguments, but ~~the~~ Neg got some fundamental pts wrong. It's a tough topic and I appreciate the ~~the~~ efforts 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	Prospect CN	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
3	Dan Chiriaev	26	3
①	Larry Nguyen	28	1

NEGATIVE (skins first)

POS	Sumprep FC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Nick Fantuzzi	27	2
4	Kevin Cannon	25	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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF bright up certain points in the final speech such as terrorism which was ignored. (Not cool).

Neg's contention of \$80 billion (~~\$240~~) was offset by the AFF's contention that it is \$240 & that tied with their investment contention will provide growth.

For this reason I vote Aff.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL (Saraboga)

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Leland DS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Sam Deghuee	29	1
3	Dominic Sonkowsky	28	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Poly DK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Nishanth Dara	26	4
2	Kartikeya Krishna	29	2

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:

Topicality argument by Neg was good but the Neg team never showed why AFF plan had an issue in the first place. When Neg was showing ~~why~~ that their plan had better saving, AFF was ~~arguing~~ that ~~they~~ how much their plan was saving.

Several off topic ~~was~~ discussion were brought up by Neg which were irrelevant (iphone 6, 30 ships will make the difference, etc).

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	DiaVal WK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	David Wang	28	1
3	Karthik Konath	26	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Prospect SL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Krishnan Srinivasan	26	3
2	Aaron Latta	27	2

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: Kevin Kunes

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF
 Was a little abusive, says the capital gains tax capital gains not capital gains tax. That he's said Aff did win topicality. They DID say Aff were unreasonable/un-educational but side from false accusations your T went good. 1970 evidence was detailed very well, Flowed Aff-ive. Not much time spent on why short term investors were bad or evidence on whether it could cause an increase of long term or just an overall decrease. Main point was largely an AFF victory out was contingent on avoiding financial crisis all together, which you eventually brought out of.

NEG
 Topicality argument is sloppy. Limiting to 3 possibilities (all dealing with the same kind of tax) is definitely not convincing. Attacks to solvency were a bit strenuous. (Need to solve for all debt?) and did not win that states you was working. 1970s evidence was convincing, but did not explain why it was relevant to short term. (2 alternatives). However, logic behind short term investors being beneficial flowed Negative. Sure more not with case dependent on Topicality argument.

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 Max = 30	RANKS
1	Krishna Madhusudan	27	1
3	Kaustubh Vinchure	26	2

NEGATIVE

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

The better debating was done by the AFF from Everg MV
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
 Extremely repetitive vs. Repetition
 is not clarity. That said,
 very strong case. Debt analysis was
 well grounded, DA's... held (inc)
 links were a bit shaky) and
 dismissed NEG's CP early on.
 More than made up for
 dropped argument that divides
 between big business corruption

NEG
 Great potential but lacked
 organization. Dropped several
 points (Environment, Small Business Threats
 into Big Business etc.) Also, it's not
 okay to make new arguments
 (unintentional claim) in last
 speech. Case was well written
 but poorly defended.

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 Max = 30	RANKS
	Kushol Bhattacharjee	26.1	3
	Michael Ong	25.3	4

NEGATIVE

POS	St. Mary RC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Aidan Reed	29.9	2
	Adriana Contreras	28.3	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from St. Mary 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:

I voted NEG because they had clear explanations and strong points. They were effective in arguing that higher interest rates will only harm the consumer economy b/c of low interest rates equate to higher consumer confidence. People would want to purchase less "big ticket" items b/c of the expensive loans. Because of the ability of consumers to afford loans, they were successful in proving that their spending abilities are better for the economy vs the Aff team, they were not successful in proving how interest rates from banks would benefit people. It was a good point that they were trying to argue that people would be able to save more, but they could not clearly explain how much people can save and how beneficial that would be. It would be great if they could have actually proven how much over time money would have increased w/ an increased interest rate.

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 Max = 30	RANKS
2	Sudeep Raj	27	4
1	Jerry Yang	27	3

NEGATIVE

POS	SumPrep GS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Julia Gross	30	1
2	Alexander Stoddard	29	2

The better debating was done by the NEG from SumPrep 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:

MB for US
 corp → biz
 less taxes on Vbiz

1. Not 180b (going to 1100b in 5y) from this tax

2. Sys skewed enuf in favor of biz
 way lower than indiv tax
 got 5x more from

3. check against excess corp power
 Lowering tax rate is bad for democracy

1. Its doubling, or we're losing any money

1. cant default on debt → need rev for closing def

1. Indv make up larger part of base

1. Still immoral to discrim

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Prospect GS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
3	Rohan Grover	27	4
1	Mayank Srivastava	27.5	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Leland KT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Donghun Kang	28	2
2	Robert Tseng	28	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: Christina

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Mayank: you're a good speaker however, work on your flow.

Rohan: need a little more improvement on your speech delivery.

Robert: Great speaker as well as refuting your opponents contentions.

Donghun: you are also a good speaker! Nice job backing up your contentions.

Reason for decision: NEG won this round. AFF showed very little ref benefits as well as not stating their plan clearly. NEG touched on AFF's 1st contention but very subtly. would have liked to see more refutation on that. Good job!

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 Max = 30	RANKS
3	Michael Tom	27	4
3	Gokul Asokan	27.5	2.

NEGATIVE

POS	Leland NW	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Bang Nguyen	27.5	3
2	Young Wu	28	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: Christina

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Gokul: you are a good speaker.
Need to work on your flow.
Your contentions also were
not strong enough in my
opinion. emphasize just a
little more.

Michael: Good job! reiterated
your contentions and added
more ~~examples~~ to strengthen
your contentions.

Young: Good speaker! Great job
refuting and contentions were
strong. First contention could
have used more evidence.

Bang: Good speaker as well!
The example you gave about
loans helped emphasize your
idea.

Reason for decision: NEG won this case b/c they
were able to show the net-benefit. AFF did not
touch opposition's contention concerning interest
rates for student loans. Do not drop contentions!

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

AFFIRMATIVE

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

NEGATIVE

POS	JamLog MC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Mark Mabie	28	3
2	Ashley Chang	27	4

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

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

Signed: D. Nip

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Selected Topic: USFG should significantly reduce the Corporate tax.
Excellent presentations and close call. AFF addressed
Content as slightly better over ~~the~~ NEG. It's a CLOSE CALL.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Wash ST	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Manveer Singh	27	2
4	Abhinav Tripathy	24	4.

NEGATIVE

POS	Mountview LH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Daniel Leybzon	29	1
	Sam Holton	27	3

The better debating was done by the NEG from MOUNTAINVIEW LH.
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:

Selected Topic: USFG should extend all the Bush tax cuts
12:45.
AFF Team would have better differentiated 'CORPORATE' vs 'PERSONAL' income tax and needs logical statements connecting to the stated contention. AFF Team defend boundaries very well and stated the problem, but subsequently they crossed those boundaries.
NEG Team clearly highlighted 'CORPORATE' vs 'PERSONAL' and provided enough logical statements to statements they are making.

~~Ab~~ ~~[Signature]~~

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	NotDam BD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Shruthi Basireddy	27.5	2
2	Meredith Duflock	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Wash KM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
3	Lemar Karimi	25.5	4
4	Vignesh Muruganatham	26	3

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

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

Signed: Ed Shires, J

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1st Shruti
 Good explanation of procedures
 • explanation of individuality + corp
 • converse addressed too / → moral 2011
 • good eye contact / fair pace of speech
 • include summary

2nd Meredith
 Conviction is good/ even strong
 • good counter to lemar
 • benefits explained + good counter evidence
 • reiterate explanation on 2%
 • corporation comment is good
 of unemployment
 • cap + trade, not clear

Shruti
 • good rebuttals
 • good confidence
 • hammered down w/ mention of 2 wars.

1st Lemar
 Speaks very fast (please slow down)
 • irrelevant of mention of 9/11
 • intentions were not clear
 Counterpoints/disadvantage
 • need to provide solid's (not giving resolutions) - only noted problems.
 • Good summary
 • Just education going forward

2nd Vignesh
 • just provide solid not just identify
 • speaks too fast
 • not substantive of deficit increase
 • good speaker though

Lemar
 • lot of substance except:
 education

The aff team provided more concrete evidence to substantiate their claim.
 The neg team should speak more slowly and define the reasons for the neg using possible outcomes in the future and not just pointing to historical evidence.
 The aff team hammered home the difference in the final focus and exuded high confidence whereas the neg appeared dejected. Overall the aff team provided more insight and appeared more persuasive.

R2

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic "USFG should allow the military sequester to occur"

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Saratoga AU	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Elnaz Ahmadi	24	4
2	Krishna Unadkat	25	3

NEGATIVE

POS	MountView LA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Leland Lee	28	1
2	Tom Ashkenazi	26	2

The better debating was done by the Neg from Mountview LA
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)
Elnaz eye contact very good, clear and loud voice, good job, and stay in the subject very well. consistent to the what she want to say, but no confident and not memorizing to the task, you need to work hard in this, you need to give more interest to the task, with more sources to go with it to ~~sp~~ support your speech. Keep the experience, it will take their.

Krishna (2)
good speaking and good job, well done you just need more confident in the subject, it will take you their - memorizing very important - keep the good work. But you both accomplish your speech.

Neg

Leland
eye contact, clear and loud voice with very good confident, and well searching the task, and memorized. gesture was good with the talk. your rebuttal was very polite, and targeting the point stayed in your subject.
Keep the good work and more.

Tom (2)
speak well, and good job, you need more eye contact - but your memorizing was okay, but your understanding the point make easy for you to accomplish the task - keep the good work you both was consistent and has the ability to persuasive.

(R2)

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic "USFG should extend all the Bush tax cuts."

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Everg GZ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Brighu Gollabinnie	28	1
2	Kenny Zhang	27	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Leland CY	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Joseph Chen	26	4
2	Grant Yun	26	3

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

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

Signed: Susannah Bond

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: AFF

(1) Brighu very confident and strong, but you need to respect the wishes of the other side do ask question - always make a time.
 eye contact very well and polite. the ability to explain is well consty your rebuttal point well prepared, good memorized.

(2) Kenny, strong and also very confident. just you need to memorized your ~~debate~~ debate answer, will be more standing.

Both of you are knowing the subject, made a good quality of job through the ~~speech~~ debate.

very will both of you accomplishing your task.

neg

Joseph confident, but need more work in consistent the point you try to ~~make~~ make. your refutation if show work, but again you need consistent in the point. special when you use source.
 also, keep the good work, just more practice.

Grant, aggressive more than confident, which is good, but you need to be more confident.
 You did a good job approving your point you have a good speech and memorized.
 You put a lot of efforts and eye contacts

Both of you was persuasive and having a ~~well~~ ~~speech~~ speech.
 very will both of you accomplishing your task.

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 Max = 30	RANKS
	Ashton Wu (PM)	28	2
	Clifford Zhang (MG)	29	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Everg CT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Namrata Challa (MO)	26	4
	Shivani Thombare (LO)	27	3

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: V. Meenas

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Comments given orally on "general parliamentary process" to both teams.
Shivani is a very passionate speaker.
Ashton very calm and collected - made for a "good" PM!
Clifford played a good job of supporting his PM while Namrata supported her leader of the Opp beautifully.
Nice debate.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	NotDam ZP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Ciara Zambo (pm)	26	4
	Michelle Pashby (MG)	27	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Sumprep LD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Daniel Loran (LO)	29	1
	Ian DeLisle (MO)	28	2

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

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

Signed: V. Meenakshi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Policy adopted by Govt. was circulate more money causing inflation & the Opp. said it is not a good idea. The opp's counter plan to change interest rates for the interim (even as gave a period of 8 years etc.) gave them an edge over the govt's lack of plan over a timeline.

Overall, all speakers were a little hesitant but the govt. team appeared more nervous than the opposition.

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 Max = 30	RANKS
M6	Shauray Agrawal	29	2
PM	Justin Chiang	30	1

NEGATIVE

POS	JamLog NF	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
LO	Yari Nieves-Rivera	29	3
MO	Josue Flores	27	4

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: Ryan Reid

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Res: USFG should extend all the bush tax cuts

OK. So I have issues with the "CP" put forth by the neg because it reads on my flow as: "We will tax everyone according to income", That IS the status quo, which the Aff points out.

The Aff has some issues with their historic warrants that neg could have non-unique'd (regan also raised taxes, and argued that this isn't the 30's/60's) but the ^{Aff} wins

the debate in the M6 and PMR.

While the neg gets the definitions the Aff gets the arguments especially on the perm, and the fact that PMR points out a shift in the LO/MO from ~~changing~~ "tax according to income" to "taxing the rich". The PMR further wins on the Turn and the impact Calc.

For neg I would recommend:

- better time management
- don't shift in the MO
- Potential better CP might have been: "flat tax"

For Aff:

- be sure your warrants actually help you, a good team will turn your warrants on you
- define/explain things a bit more and quantify things as well

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 AA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
PM	Jamie Avery	26	3
Mo	Stephanie Andrade	27	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga KP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
Lo	Ishaan Kolluri	30	1
Mo	Neil Prasad	29	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: Ryan Reid

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Reg! The Fed reserve should significantly increase the money supply
I vote neg because they give me more historical background
with QE 1, 2, 3 being brought up. Also they win the idea that no matter
what Aff increases the money supply which is bad

For both teams I would recommend more structure
and quantification. Tell me how many people you effect, How that
happens through plan, and WHY that's bad

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Sumprep BP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Amanda Barth	25.3	4
	Bixby Ponteri	25.4	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Poly SS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	AJ Singh	28.1	1
	Pete Sanders	27.7	2

The better debating was done by the NEG from Poly SS
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 voted NEG because they were effective in proving that a solution of lowering income on lower/mid class would allow them to spend more and create a better flow in economy. This is a stronger point than aff. saying people can spend more when corp. taxes are lower. It is a stronger point from neg side because it is realistic that the more money people are able to pocket, the more they feel like they can purchase.

Aff.

cook up more
Amanda-gather thoughts
to speak w/ conviction.

neg

Pete-less swaying
but, stronger presenters
both
confident speaking.