

OPEN LD

ROUND 4

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

James Logan Ritchie

Max = 30

Leland Hu, R

Max = 30

Nathan Ritchie

28

Rebecca Hu

26

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

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

Signed: Mary M. Disher

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirm

The debater open the topic very clearly & with confidence regarding the affirm. side.

Negative

This debater had a strong presence with her delivery

The affirmative established why the U.S. ought to extend same constitutional due process to NON-citizens because of his arguments to protect citizens from abuse against torture, stranger country (NO laws) & humanitarian treatment.

The negative tried to focus on equal protection of law, but did not affirmatively address the three points above of affirm. & ~~strong~~ enough evidence, & that terrorism overall was not enough to validate NO DUE EXCESS of law. N

Room: O Connor 201
Flight B: Start 8:45am
Open Lincoln Douglas

4

~~Wong, Phil~~
RAO AVULA (LOSALTOS HIGH)

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

| AFFIRMATIVE | POINTS | NEGATIVE | POINTS |
|------------------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|
| Evergreen Tallapragada | Max = 30 | Lynbrook Wang | Max = 30 |
| Armit Tallapragada | <u>28</u> | Christine Wang | <u>27</u> |

The better debating was done by the Aff from Evergreen Tallapragada.
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:

Statistics about the approval ratings by Arab and other countries are convincing. Also convincing about how people live around Guantanamo Bay area affected by imprisoning the terrorists there. Cuba likes or not etc. Analytical reasons of ~~the~~ other nations like US about the total process.

The neg lacking evidence to support the arguments. Not supportive of analytical evidence. Even though the arguments are convincing and great but not more support of ~~the~~ the own arguments. therefore I vote for aff.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

| AFFIRMATIVE | POINTS | NEGATIVE | POINTS |
|---------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------|
| Bishop O Dowd Nouri | Max = 30 | Saratoga Munukutla | Max = 30 |
| Koosha Nouri | <u>28.8</u> | Venkat Munukutla | <u>28.6</u> |

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

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

Signed: Mr. Hoque

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

| AFF. | NEG |
|-------------|------------|
| Govim) 0.9 | |
| Cooy 0.3 | 0.6 |
| In Touch | 1.2 |
| Cooh 0.3 | 0.5 |
| AFFCgm) 0.8 | 0.7 |
| Max Com | |
| Aff. 3m 0.5 | |
| <u>2.8</u> | <u>2.6</u> |

Venkat: ~~has~~ has control and over debate and attacked his opponent. However he occasionally ended up supporting the opponent with his arguments. He should have stopped about citizenship in Guantanamo once opponent proved him wrong. Koosha: Max more points for current cases. Defended his Guantanamo Bay data confidently.

Room: Loyola 132
Flight B: Start 8:45am
Open Lincoln Douglas

4

~~Bhateja, Rajiv~~

SHALINI PACHAURI

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL Marker

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

| AFFIRMATIVE | POINTS | NEGATIVE | POINTS |
|----------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Oakwood Mathur | Max = 30 | Palo Alto Haris | Max = 30 |
| Shivani Mathur | <u>28.1</u> | Anish Haris | <u>26.2</u> |

The better debating was done by the Affirmative from SHIVANI MATHUR.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Shalini Pachauri

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff - Great delivery,
Confident, some points
Could be more clear (Too fast in some cases)
Kept time well.

Neg. - Good presenter,
Some areas could be
more fluent. Stayed
on track.

RFD.

The affirmative supported their case well with defining the resolve, their value clearly and supported it well with evidence of the Constitutional rights and 5th & 14th amendment. The aff also stayed close to the topic and argued well on the contentions of the opponent.

The negative gave good argument about how terrorists cannot be treated the same as other criminals, and how the citizens have more responsibilities compared to non-citizen to their country. However they neg did not support their value well, and gave non-convincing arguments for due processes that the aff contended.

In all, I feel that the affirmative won as they were able to establish that Justice and constitutional rights of all Humans are equal and need to be protected equally.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

| AFFIRMATIVE | POINTS | NEGATIVE | POINTS |
|-------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------|
| Harker Rao | Max = 30 | Palo Alto Moraes-Liu | Max = 30 |
| Sagar Rao | <u>26.1</u> | Juliana Moraes-Liu | <u>27.6</u> |

The better debating was done by the neg from Juliana Moraes-Liu
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative presented his case well but during the cross-examination he was not able to support his case well. Negative presented her case well and was able to also support it; therefore I chose neg.

Room: Benson 21
Flight B: Start 8:45am
Open Lincoln Douglas

4

SHAH, MONALI
~~Mann, Supreet~~

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

| AFFIRMATIVE | POINTS | NEGATIVE | POINTS |
|---------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|
| Milpitas Garg | Max = 30 | James Logan Q-Tran | Max = 30 |
| Rakshit Garg | <u>28</u> | Louis Q-Tran | <u>27</u> |

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

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

Signed: M Shah

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff - Good Delivery
- good rebuttal

Neg Good delivery
Work on bigger impact

RFD

In the end, the utopian argument for ICC is not able to hold ground. AFF won the case on impacts supporting the VC. ~~cc~~

Room: Sobrato B-D
Flight B: Start 8:45am
Open Lincoln Douglas

4

Fakhri, Tawab

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE |||| |||| ||

POINTS

NEGATIVE ||||

POINTS

Westmont Fishbin

Max = 30

MSJ Natarajan

Max = 30

Rachelle Fishbin

27

Arvinhd Natarajan

25

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: Loyola 136
Flight B: Start 8:45am
Open Lincoln Douglas

4

MSJ-LD-05, MSJ-L

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

| AFFIRMATIVE | POINTS | NEGATIVE | POINTS |
|-----------------------------|-----------|------------------------|-----------|
| Diablo Valley Mishra | Max = 30 | Palo Alto Zheng | Max = 30 |
| Archit Mishra | <u>25</u> | Austin Zheng | <u>22</u> |

The better debating was done by the Aff. from Archit Mishra
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.
Human Rights
Due process Rights
— x —

Examples

Applicable only inside United States

Neg.
Moral Value.
— x —
Jurisdiction
obligation to citizens.
Equal Rights

Room: O Connor 207
Flight B: Start 8:45am
Open Lincoln Douglas

4

~~Muvvala, Mr.~~
Suzanne Yang

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

MSJ Desai, A.

Anuj Desai

POINTS

Max = 30

27.8

NEGATIVE

Palo Alto Braun

Noa Braun

POINTS

Max = 30

28.9

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

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

Signed: Suzanne Yang

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The Negative presentation was delivered more fluidly, and also she appeared to have a better command of the topic, because her opponent mostly read from prepared statements. The Negative conclusively refuted the affirmative arguments through an excellent rebuttal, point by point. Affirmative talked more rapidly and was less organized in presenting points. Affirmative needs to make more eye contact and develop better command of the issues.

Affirmative used an interesting frame work for the argument that was outside of the box and could have thrown off an opponent who was less confident debater

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bishop O Dowd Mortarotti

Max = 30

Leland Kim

Max = 30

Dominick Mortarotti

29

Yi Youn Kim

28.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from Dominick Mortarotti
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 affirmative made a very narrow case about specific rights: why retained, impartial decision-maker & right to counsel and not the requirement to use the Federal court system. The negative case argued that human rights would not be better protected & gave a great example of a harmful disclosure as a result of a trial. But by the affirmative case so narrowly defining due process rights, the negative case's contentions weren't as strong.

Both debaters ~~are~~ extremely well prepared and did a great job responding to the other's position.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

La Reina Draper

Max = 30

Bonita Vista Dawson

Max = 30

Kate Draper

27.0

Imani Dawson

27.6

The better debating was done by the NEG from Imani Dawson - Bonita Vista
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Jeetendra Jangle

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff.
 1) Terrorism Violates US Law.
 2) Constitution right US is obligated to protect.
 1) Obligation
 2) Efficient trial - Speedy trial - GB has no trial jrs no trials
 3) Johnson - case. China - German Constitutional due process No trial @ GB. - Due process
 4) Non terrorist held @ GB. - quick trial.
 5) Can release.

Neg
 3000 American / Oxford English - Public safety. - Bush -
 1) military courts handle better. - Guilty can go free
 2) Donald Lowelou FBI -
 3) US should not release info. for safety
 4) Value NS @ des, not help to behave
 5) Terrorist can go free
 6) Innocent - can go free
 7) Capitalist society
 8) Things don't go too far @ GB.
 9) Interrogation is humane.
 10) intel. imense.

Neg Cont = Neg - CF
 1) Public Safety
 2) mil tribunal. Do they fall constitutional due process.
 3) kept in detain. defination. - proof.
 4) Detention is necessary.
 5) human rights due process
 6) NS, PS are Synonym

Aff Rebuttal
 1) - PS = NS sacrifice quality of life @ GB.
 2) mil Trib better. X - They are not fair trial - some due process
 3) Uphold to NS.
 4) recruit name terrorist in prison
 5) Human rights upheld but others
 6) Agrees Constitution Obdiverw PE
 7) Decisions & pro

Room: O Connor 102
Flight B: Start 8:45am
Open Lincoln Douglas

4

~~Walsh, Kim~~
Mishra, T.C.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

| AFFIRMATIVE | POINTS | NEGATIVE | POINTS |
|---------------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|
| Evergreen Sinnarkar | Max = 30 | MSJ Wadhera | Max = 30 |
| Violet Sinnarkar | <u>28</u> | Karuna Wadhera | <u>26</u> |

The better debating was done by the Aff. from Evergreen
AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: ~~Mishra~~

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative - She presented a very good case. Her definition of all the value criteria was excellent. She was able to throw out all the cross-exam questions. She is very articulate in her case.

Neg: - Her case started strong but lost the focus later on. She was not able to answer the cross exam questions. She was not able to define the value of citizen & non citizen based on their birth. Her argument was very weak.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

| AFFIRMATIVE | POINTS | NEGATIVE | POINTS |
|----------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|
| Lynbrook Walia | Max = 30 | MSJ Prasad | Max = 30 |
| Dhruv Walia | <u>27</u> | Abhinav Prasad | <u>26</u> |

The better debating was done by the AFFIRMATIVE from DHRUV WALIA
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 MAIN VALUE CRITERIA IS INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.

GOOD CROSS EXAMINATION BUT COULD NOT GET POINTS ON WHY BETTER INTERNATIONAL RELATION IS REQUIRED AS REQUIRED.

CROSS EXAMINATION
SOFT SMART POWER CONTAIN
SOFT POWER.

THE POINT ABOUT SOFT POWER VERSUS SMART POWER.

2:03 left
GOOD QUESTION ABOUT HOW TARGETED KILLING SAVE INNOCENT LIVES?

1:53
PROVIDE A EXAMPLE OF WHY HARD POWER LIKE KILLING OSAMA WORKS?

REBUTTEL ON HARD POWER/SMART POWER.

REBUTTEL ON US-CHINA RELATION HAS NO BEARING WITH MIDDLE EASTERN RELATION

Room: Benson 15
Flight B: Start 8:45am
Open Lincoln Douglas

4

Iyer, Natasha

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL


11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

| AFFIRMATIVE | POINTS | NEGATIVE | POINTS |
|---------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Mountain View Thvar | Max = 30 | Bishop O Dowd Baldwin | Max = 30 |
| Keshav Thvar | <u>26.0</u> | Tealanie Baldwin | <u>26.5</u> |

The better debating was done by the Neg from Bishop
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 didn't response some of the arguements.

Baldwin Speaks too fast.

Room: O Connor 209
Flight B: Start 8:45am
Open Lincoln Douglas

4

Chou, Kevin

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Saratoga Hsiao

Max = 30

Palo Alto McNamara

Max = 30

Derek Hsiao

27

Addie McNamara

26

The better debating was done by the AFP from Derek
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:

arguments were not conducted as well

Room: O Connor 110
Flight B: Start 8:45am
Open Lincoln Douglas

4

Gao, Guilian

SCU DEMPSEY-C RONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Diablo Valley Vu

Max = 30

MSJ Zhang

Max = 30

Alex Vu

George Zhang

The better debating was done by the Negative from George Zhang
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Ali Gao

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Alex Vu was absent.

Room: O Connor 109
Flight B: Start 8:45am
Open Lincoln Douglas

4 ~~WARRIOR 1, DEBAT~~
JOHN BORECZYK JAMES LOGAN St

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

MSJ Dhara

Max = 30

St Mary's Valdez

Max = 30

Raghu Dhara

Daniel Valdez

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

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

Signed: _____

John Boreczyk

JOHN BORECZYK

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~NEG~~
AFF

NEG

DID NOT SHOW.

BYE FOR THE

Room: O Connor 106
Flight B: Start 8:45am
Open Lincoln Douglas

4

MSJ-LD-04, MSJ-L

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

James Logan Lee

Max = 30

Bishop O Dowd Clark

Max = 30

Jia Hui Lee

27

Graham Clark

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from GRAHAM CLARK / BISHOP O DOWD
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: T. Siminas

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff started well by presenting arguments in support of the case but arguments weakened towards the end. Neg was able to defend well.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

MSJ Paramasivan

Max = 30

Bonita Vista Mariscal

Max = 30

Santhosh Paramasivan 28.1

Alexander Mariscal 28.6

The better debating was done by the AFF from Santhosh Paramasivan

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)
 Affirmative is most
 value-morality
 (1) Suspected terrorist not
 treated equally
 person not citizen, distinction
 status
 (2) Affirmative lacks
 corpus protection
 - Torture - Abductee
 - Allocation of external
 allies
 Affirmative Alignment of
 US Principles
 (3) Affirmative cannot be
 proven innocent, it was
 given opportunity
 - Calcutta Experiment
 No benefit Rehabilitation
 rotate

(NEG)
 Criticism - Minimization
 of US casualties
 (1) Would overwhelm us
 court system.
 - security
 - safety
 - protection of confidential
 source
 Economic limitations
 (2) Conventional system
 breeds terrorists -
 US conventional institutions
 are terrorist breeding group
 Affirmative value at morality
 too broad. Because of
 equality argument.
 Affirmative as conclusion.
 (1) No reason why to
 point at equality of
 punishment? p 300
 (2) Habeas assumed remedy
 - does not require torture
 (3) Failed to respond
 to lack of opportunity

ARI
 (1) Infringe terrorists, causing terrorist
 containing terrorist & not necessary
 (2) **CEPA** text
 to attack classified duty leak?
 in counterterrorism one.
 (2) No evidence that as torturer
 that is going on
 points out that Neg has
 no evidence
 (3) Points out that 3rd counterterrorism
 was not addressed

NR
 (1) Does not ~~pose~~ defend framework
 attack on morality.
 effectively distinguishing constitutional
 due process, from general due process.
 Slavery analogy
 (2) Counter that Military tribunals
 do not equate with torture.
 Argue that
 (3) CEPA - not constitutional due process
 Does Terrorism is not equivalent to
 attempted terrorism.

Comments
 Aff's response to
 cross-exam was weakly
 seemed to run counter
 to his case
 Aff is better at
 cross, gets to heart of
 matter and has good follow
 up
 Neg did not address the
 3rd counterterrorism that accused
 terrorists are not given
 opportunity to defend themselves
 in the current system
 Both speakers rely too
 heavily on reading in their
 openings
 Negative logic is very
 good at some points, but
 will take it to the point
 where he hurts his own
 argument.
 Aff frequently linked
 his argument back to
 morality value.

(1) Aff attacks in
 cross in lack of evidence,
 or weakness of duty
 (2) Response to why are
 military tribunals better
 than secrecy
 (1)

what does mean by
 equality
 Point - wish all human
 rights be given?
 What is view of some go
 on terrorism? (Neg
 used response from Aff)

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto Warner

Max = 30

MSJ Chopra

Max = 30

Alex Warner

26

Aditya Chopra

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from Aditya Chopra
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 vote for the NEG case for this debate. They were able to defend all of the main points w/ Evidence we were able to back them up during the X-exam. one thing the Neg could have done was provide more evidence for their 2nd contention.
- The Aff needs to have more evidence to help back up her contentions. All her contentions were good and made sense but the lack of evidence made them easy to attack.

Room: Parlor B
Flight B: Start 8:45am
Open Lincoln Douglas

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Saratoga Krishna

Max = 30

Palo Alto Gupta

Max = 30

Rohith Krishna

30

Madhu Gupta

27

The better debating was done by the AFF from SARATOGA - ROHITH KRISHNA
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Madhu

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Morality - Tribunals unfair.
National Security is the criteria in courts as well. Similarly guilty
2 people need to be treated same.
Military trials are more unfair.
Murray has procedural safeguards. President power is only to
lessen the guilt.
Different due process.
2 supreme courts evidence. Newer from neg.
Tanen dropped.
I would vote for Aff in this case as he presented
his case and arguments much better. He won the
ground based on treating individuals the same
when they are guilty at the same level
safeguarding morality and ensuring accurate guilt
verdict. The Neg did have a different due
process contention with military trials being fair, but
legal authority as the value. But she conceded to
the value to be with the Aff's value of morality.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bonita Vista Rosal

Max = 30

MSJ Calambur

Max = 30

Joebert Rosal

27.0

Vivek Calambur

28.1

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

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

2 min.

2 min prep 2:42 use

Signed: S. L.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

Value: justice

Content: quality of due process - utilitarian application

- Content 1: Guantanamo Bay / torture
- 2. protecting accused rec. else country more terrorism, misrepresentation of US + fuel more terrorism

we 4% accused guilty

Justice vs. public safety
value rights + util

impact on prosecution - lead leg.

NOTU:

NEG

Value: public safety

Content: utilitarianism need to exercise power over protection

- Content 1: Morrison Indemnification torturers
- 2. public safety system not equipped to deal w/ terrorism Terrorist power is a layer that the media

address AFF

public safety > justice

Content: utilitarianism, protect, most good for most people else about preventing further what

proposed soln: military tribunals over court court by law No torture

The neg. established that due to the extremely dangerous nature of terrorism, public safety is a value that must supersede justice in order to protect the majority of the people. The AFF's contention that guaranteeing due process would fuel terrorism makes sense but was not documented. I would've liked to hear more from neg. about a proposed solution. AFF didn't address second content for neg.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL


11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

| AFFIRMATIVE | POINTS | NEGATIVE | POINTS |
|-------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|
| St Francis Ratnam | Max = 30 | Palo Alto Parker | Max = 30 |
| Sheryl Ratnam | <u>30</u> | Coby Parker | <u>28</u> |

The better debating was done by the AFF from St. Francis
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: Maximum Human Right. Good. clear speech. well organized.
~~lack~~^{good} examples. evidence. excellent debator.

Neg: protect ^{their} own citizens.
terrorist start before the war. good comments.
no statis data for affirm.
leak out information. right can not count.

Aff: good argument for measure right.

Neg: More Life saved is important. government protect citizen first.

war and terrorist. statistic.

Aff: Very good job. give good statistic #
So I vote for Aff.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL


11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

| AFFIRMATIVE | POINTS | NEGATIVE | POINTS |
|----------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|
| Evergreen Shen | Max = 30 | James Logan Rahimi | Max = 30 |
| Russell Shen | <u>28</u> | Rod Rahimi | <u>27</u> |

The better debating was done by the AFF from Evergreen
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: Very good comments. your fade ^{should not be B} decided by where you are born.

well organized.
Good conclusion. so I vote for Aff.

Neg: Clear presentation. well organized.
very good defence. catch the key point.
good debator.

SCU DEMPSLEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

Palo Alto Ho

Jeffrey Ho

POINTS

Max = 30

27

NEGATIVE

Evergreen Naik

Akshay Naik

POINTS

Max = 30

27

The better debating was done by the NEG from EVERGREEN - AKSHAY
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME
NAIK

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

Signed: Madhava

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

6 Bay Torture
Allied Partners - soft power
& save
lose war on terror without
Pitfalls - Inc terror due process list with terrorists
Due process - Justice pitfalls.
Torture → Net Benefits
Guilty → not "
Not fighting alone today
fighting with allies
We are winning the fight of terror.

Tied Net Benefits back to his contentions.
VC Debate:
Limiting torture → 1 person → 7 billion → No Net Benefits
Citizens vs non citizens in the Aff VC not there so no burden.
Military tribunals worked.
Soft power -----
detainees & to know suspects
fighting alone... today
allied & fighting wins.

MIT winning
CEBA failed - Net loss.
Abuse due process to get out
Tools to give coop have not worked
Net Benefits for 1 person
due process not used today
7 B due process - lives saved
torture I does not benefit 7 billion

I gave the round to NEG
since AFF did not have a strong hold during 1/2 of his arguments.
He came back beautifully at the end but lost due to some args that he could not bring back up.
No

International Security encompassed within net benefits.
Due Process info leaked anyways.
Due Process provides for soft power. Military commissions private.
They have stopped some forms. Reputation affected. Changing something that works now.
Case shows value criterion
How citizens & non citizens (classified info) treated differently. Net benefit for innocent. Security is safe in courts. No leaks. Cooperation in courts - Inc net benefit of human life & constitutionality.
Jeff could be a little more confident & not let the opponent take over even if he/she speaks aggressively.

Lee, Shelly

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Milpitas Ngo

Max = 30

MSJ Rajvanshy

Max = 30

Jonathan Ngo

26.3

Raghav Rajvanshy

24.8

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

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

Signed: S. Lee

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:
 non-citizen Terrorists ^{depressed} granted same rights as citizens ^{US} here

Raghav

Aff (Lee)

X

ought = obligation

✓ ~~decent~~ morality

lottery of birth

veil of ignorance

veil of ignorance - stereotype

- a. due process in inherent rights
- b. Nat'l human rights law closest
- c. no diff of citizen/non citizen used quote Cole
- d. terrorism amplified as consequence
- e. ~~rights-bearing~~ challenging or ^{ideals}

Value - Not starting comparisons

and due process - is carried by citizens who are responsible upholding social contract + some to bond laws

related with argument ought debn.

rights court inherent vs. regular due process ~~that~~ give transparency; ^{serious} into

Value criteria - must have inherent rights.

Social contract - help US better + view var

U.N. laws / rights. ~~most~~ ^{most} universally agreed on

I voted for the aff because He clearly laid out his criteria, they value and arguments using evidence. The neg didn't address all of the arguments and needed to research arguments to prove his value was best. Social contract cannot mitigate the lottery of birth morality argument.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

La Reina Sullivan

Max = 30

Palo Alto Huang

Max = 30

Kathleen Sullivan

28.5


Ryan Huang

27

The better debating was done by the AFF from Kathleen Sullivan
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 vote for the AFF case for this debate. The Aff case was able to stick to the values and criteria that they presented at the start very well. The Aff's only weakness was contention #2, they needed to back it up a little more.

- The Neg needs to stick with his value and criteria. He let the Aff change his side which made him contradict some of his case.

Scott Bartner

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland Hu, E

Max = 30

MSJ Bisen

Max = 30

Ethan Hu

29.0

Yash Bisen

~~28.0~~ 29.1

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

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

Signed: Scott A. Bartner

Comments

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affir
 1) Due Process Defined
 2) Moral Duty Issue
 (A) Terrorist Def
 (B) Violates Human Rights

My
 Best system of
 1) With oversight count
 2) Allows more terrorists into us by
 weaker immigration standards

AR1
 Feasibility of minor point
 of My
 National Security - Dropped
 - Negative Prop's gain

Aff had a good showing
 of correspondence between
 contentions and value
 criteria.

Aff was able to
 point out 2 arguments
 that were not
 rebutted by neg.

Negatives use of
 term "let" is strong
 but disruptive.

Negative did not
 attack ~~rebuttal~~
 splitting up of the
 concept of due process
 into 2 varieties.

Aff had a good
 2nd rebuttal. Responded
 to the ad hominem attack.
 and was able to
 point out which
 contentions were not
 responded to.

VR
 1) Must talk about what us
 2) Value criteria argument follow
 3) My response to further issues
 4) Superior evidence
 5) Not supreme resolution to
 6) ~~superior~~ superior

Actio
 attack proposition
 that there is only

(Cross-ex)
 Given is not
 date aff
 How are My - litise Ash
 Good reason us of

Both debates were
 very good.

Room: O Connor 106
Flight A: Start 8:00am
Open Lincoln Douglas

4

MSJ-LD-04, MSJ-L

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Mountain View Hulett

Max = 30

St Francis Singh

Max = 30

James Hulett

27

Akriti Singh

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from AKRITI / ST FRANCIS
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: T. Binnick

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Negative is a good speaker and presented arguments clearly, but started contradicting herself during the final steps. Affirmative tried hard to come back but fell slightly short in winning the debate.

Room: O Connor 103
Flight A: Start 8:00am
Open Lincoln Douglas

4

~~Mandracchia, Joe~~

Pragya Batra

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

(Harker)

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

MSJ Lai

Max = 30

Leland Liu

Max = 30

Ryan Lai

~~26~~ 26

Stacy Liu

~~27~~ 27

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

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

Signed: Pragya Batra

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Leland Liu: Spoke well, sounded confident, could be using more elegant gentle.
MSJ Lai: Spoke well, could be more confident & organized.

Room: O Connor 109
Flight A: Start 8:00am
Open Lincoln Douglas

4 WARRIOR 1, DEBAT

JOHN BORECZKY LOGAN H.S.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Diablo Valley Bhargava

Max = 30

MSJ Chawla

Max = 30

Rohan Bhargava

29.5

Shweta Chawla

29

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

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

Signed: _____

John Boreczky
JOHN BORECZKY

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

THE NEG HAD A STRONG CASE THAT NATIONAL SECURITY SHOULD TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER GENERAL HUMAN RIGHTS. HOWEVER THE NEG CONCEDED THAT DUE PROCESS APPLIES TO ALL PERSONS IN U.S. TERRITORY, EVEN NON-CITIZENS. THE AFF WAS ABLE TO MAKE THE CASE THAT THIS OPENED THE DOOR ENOUGH TO MAKE THE "OUGHT" SUPPORTABLE, GOOD ROUND BY BOTH SPEAKERS.

AFF: BODY LANGUAGE, USE OF VOICE TO MAKE POINTS STRENGTHENED ARGUMENT. WELL LAID-OUT ARGUMENT.

NEG: SPOKE A BIT FAST, AND DIDN'T PUNCTUATE KEY POINTS WITH VOICE, HAND, MOTION. WELL LAID-OUT ARGUMENT, BUT AFF WAS JUST A TINY BIT STRONGER.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

St Francis Chen

Max = 30

MSJ Tummala

Max = 30

Alex Chen

27.5

Vineet Tummala

26.5

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

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

Signed: Guilian Gao

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- 1) Alex cited human right abuse as his argument against military tribunal, Vineet failed to address the issue in his rebuttal.
- 2) Alex presented a better argument for effectiveness of dual process than Vineet's argument that the dual process is too long, ineffective & harm national security
- 3) Vineet cited 9/11 attack as the case of ~~ineffectiveness~~ dual process harms national security, but fail to answer how the ~~case~~ attack could be avoided if dual process not used.
- 4) Alex used more credible, up-to-date evidence
- 5) Alex ~~had~~ better eye contact, and his speech had better clarity

Room: O Connor 209
Flight A: Start 8:00am
Open Lincoln Douglas

4

Chou, Kevin

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bishop O Dowd Hawkins

Max = 30

San Ramon Valley Gupta

Max = 30

Anna Hawkins

Rohith Gupta

No 5/10w

The better debating was done by the BY AFF from Anna Hawkins
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Default

Room: Benson 15
Flight A: Start 8:00am
Open Lincoln Douglas

4

~~Iyer, Natasha~~
Steve Shae

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Westmont Keates

Max = 30

Palo Alto Lau

Max = 30

Paula Keates

28.0

Andrew Lau

28.5

The better debating was done by the Neg from Palo Alto
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 argued very well, and presented well.

Andrew appears more passionate and confident, gave more evidence to back his view.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

| AFFIRMATIVE | POINTS | NEGATIVE | POINTS |
|--------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|
| MSJ Mittal | Max = 30 | Palo Alto Hashmi | Max = 30 |
| Mudit Mittal | <u>26</u> | Noah Hashmi | <u>28</u> |

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

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

Signed: *Ajaj*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFFIRMATIVE

Value by: Minimizing THE TERROR

ARGUMENT ABOUT TORTURE & CROSS EXAMINATION OF WHETHER TORTURE IS DONE TO ALL DISTANCES?

28 sec REBUTTAL ON TORTURE & FAMOUS POLITICIAN.

NEGATIVE

- 1) C ARGUED WELL ABOUT THE CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS.
- 2) DEFINITION OF TORTURE & HOW MANY PEOPLE TORTURED? ~~was~~

prep time:

Next 21 sec

REBUTTAL ABOUT CIPA & GREATER GOOD ABOUT US & WORLD.

ARGUMENT ABOUT

Room: O Connor 102
Flight A: Start 8:00am
Open Lincoln Douglas

4

~~Walsh, Kim~~
MISHRA, T.C.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

| AFFIRMATIVE | POINTS | NEGATIVE | POINTS |
|-----------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|
| Mountain View Bystrom | Max = 30 | Palo Alto Sandhu | Max = 30 |
| Kyle Bystrom | <u>28</u> | Jaisel Sandhu | <u>29</u> |

The better debating was done by the Neg from Palo Alto
AFFIRMATIVE 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 good definition and case. While cross exam, he was not able to distinguish between a non citizen & citizen ^{life} value. but by implying the theory of due process he was able to throw ~~out~~ ⁱⁿ the question.

The Affirmative team was not able to refute other contentions from neg.

Neg: - Presented a very good case. He was able to answer all the cross exam questions. His argument to value of life was more compelling than morality.

So - Neg team wins this round!!!

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Douglas Frost

Max = 30

Palo Alto Fee

Max = 30

Andy Frost

27.8

Shannon Fee

26.9

Douglas Frost - Andy

The better debating was done by the AFF from ~~Palo Alto~~ - ~~Shannon~~
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Jeetendra Jangle

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

| Aff | Cross | Rebuttal |
|---|--|--|
| <p>1. Marian web</p> <p>2. Honors, show life/liberty</p> <p>3. 5th, 8th amendments</p> <p>4. Reason - Bush</p> <p>Right given - entire plan 206 ref.</p> <p>5. Terrorism trial</p> <p>human rights - Detainees - 500 terrorism - 7 million</p> <p>6. Crime against Fed Gov.</p> | <p>1. Morality (acc)</p> <p>2. Impact - answer accept</p> <p>3. Justice - treatment - Not human</p> <p>4. Fair trial equiv US target</p> <p>5. Stand logical</p> <p>6. Constitution</p> <p>1. Marian Webber - morality - Hubs Morgan - Protect US citizens</p> <p>2. National Security</p> <p>3. Counter Terrorism Rights - Embassy bombing - Gathering intel</p> <p>4. Increase terrorism - M. Masalski (Idiani) - M. Sikerberg</p> <p>5. Targeted killing - Israel example</p> <p>value of justice - Dalkholoy - four rights</p> <p>cannot mention</p> | <p>3. Dalkholoy - human rights</p> <p>4. Supreme Court - ruling open to CIA</p> <p>Cross</p> <p>1. Value of Morality - States - protect rights - National Security (4th amendment)</p> <p>2. Totalitarianism without NS no life</p> <p>Quality of life</p> <p>4. Thousands killed in Pakistan - 9/11</p> |
| | | <p>Aff Rebuttal (Neg)</p> <p>1. National Security creates Totalitarian - killing is OK - immoral act</p> <p>2. Statutory - dating people</p> <p>3. 1980 SIPA act - Not 5th source</p> <p>4. 0/500 rehabilitation so no impact NS</p> <p>5. Prisons increase terrorism - No one escaped. Harms away</p> <p>6. Targeted killing</p> <p>7. Justice supersedes immorality</p> <p>8. Aff can withhold info.</p> |
| | | <p>Neg. Rebuttal (Aff)</p> <p>1. Value Criteria - Not true morality, but morality can exist without justice</p> <p>2. No response to National Security - No habeas Corpus</p> <p>3. Morgan Thaler - States 1st duty is protect</p> |

Room: Loyola 135
Flight A: Start 8:00am
Open Lincoln Douglas

4

Akella, Mr.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

James Logan Meller

Max = 30

MSJ Nayak

Max = 30

Mikhail Meller
mike


28.5

Akaash Nayak

26.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from Mikhail Meller
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 affirmative case argued that morality requires that terrorists be tried in civilian courts & substantiated the case with examples of problems with the current approach. The negative case focused on safety but didn't provide as many examples of how safety would be compromised if terrorists were tried in civilian courts.

Thank you for the excellent debate

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto Zhang, K.

Max = 30

Harker Shah

Max = 30

Kevin Zhang

28.2

Manan Shah

21.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from Kevin Zhang / PALO ALTO
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: S Yang

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative organized his points better and had better overall delivery - including good eye contact

Negative was difficult to understand at times and ~~used some~~ shifted around his papers a fair amount which was distracting.

Affirmative set up the arguments well, however could have developed more on the importance of due process.

Negative did a good job refuting some of the affirmative points but did not connect his conclusions to proof (e.g. military tribunals work - this contention was too conclusory)

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Olive Children Jen

Max = 30

Leland Loftis

Max = 30

Jesse Jen

~~19~~ 20


Cameron Loftis

24

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

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

Signed: _____



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Jesse:

Human Rights

Ethics.

Terrorism

— x —

What are the rules?

How to defend?

— x —

Leland

Examples of torture.

— x —

what CIPA.

— x —

Rights for everyone

Protect the country.

— x —

Room: Sobrato B-D
Flight A: Start 8:00am
Open Lincoln Douglas

4

Fakhri, Tawab

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE |||||

POINTS

NEGATIVE ||||

POINTS

James Logan Marsh

Max = 30

Palo Alto Robertson

Max = 30

Kendra Marsh

.76

Will Robertson

20

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

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

Signed: Tawab

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: Benson 21
Flight A: Start 8:00am
Open Lincoln Douglas

4

~~Mann, Supreet~~
SHAH, MONALI

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

MSJ Hari

Max = 30

Palo Alto Takeuchi

Max = 30

Anant Hari

~~26~~ 26

Rick Takeuchi

~~26~~ 26

The better debating was done by the

NEG

~~AFF~~

from

AFF or NEG

~~NEG Takeuchi~~

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Palo Alto Rick Takeuchi

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

Signed: _____

M. Khakh

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF - Good Delivery
- Work on expanding scope and impacts.

NEG - Good rebuttal

AFF
In the end NEG won the case as AFF was not able to hold 5th Amendment & Geneva Convention & did not address President's power raised by NEG

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Polytechnic Zhou

Max = 30

Westmont Young

Max = 30

Jimmy Zhou

26.1

Bruce Young

27.1

The better debating was done by the neg from Bruce Young
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 affirmative and the negative presented their cases very well, ~~but~~ but during the cross examination, the negative pressured the affirmative. I chose the negative.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

| AFFIRMATIVE | POINTS | NEGATIVE | POINTS |
|----------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------|
| MSJ Kalakuntla | Max = 30 | James Logan Narayannan | Max = 30 |
| Tej Kalakuntla | <u>27.6</u> | Ajjit Narayannan | <u>28.5</u> |

The better debating was done by the Affirmative from Tej Kalakuntla.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Shalini Pachauri

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative - Smooth & Clear Delivery, unperturbed, good flow.

Negative - Confident, forceful, good arguments.

The affirmative established that Justice is the most important value for protecting basic fundamental rights of any human and gave evidence of our constitution and 14th amendment of how each person is innocent until proven guilty. They also argued how power can corrupt military & judiciary and his decision could be biased.

The negative focused on morality as a value and how government needs to protect its citizens by gathering intelligence and targeted killing to minimize terrorism. His argument needs to have more support on how & why the gov. finds the accused guilty, what are the processes to determine that.

Based on these arguments, Affirmative wins This debate.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

Resolved: The United States ought to extend the same constitutional due process protections to non-citizens accused of terrorism 11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012 it grants to citizens

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto Rao

Max = 30

MSJ Sreekumar

Max = 30

Sama Rao

29.2

Sanjay Sreekumar

28.8

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

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

Signed: Hoque

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

First 6 AFF
 0.7
 - 3 min prob
0.7 / 0.3
First 7 NEG
 0.7 0.9
 0.7 0.7
 0.7 -3
 0.8 1.2
 0.5 .4
0.6
3.2120 2.8120
 29.2 28.8

AFF

CDN

current cases against citizen

strong argument for saving life.

Didn't contradict opponent's allegation about Shaughnessy vs. Shrubert state judgement.

Repetition of same case of Arowar multiple times

Japanese case use was very relevant

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Lynbrook Dong

Max = 30

Patrick Dong

27.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

MSJ Fong

Max = 30

Nathan Fong

28

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

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

Signed: Mangapetuk Rao

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The negative established the risk of extending the same constitutional rights to non citizens. Especially his arguments were more convincing in the trial of terrorists etc.

Where as affirmative was not much stronger to support how the Judiciary system can handle terrorist cases in the same civil courts without risking the safety of Judges, attorneys and others.

Therefore I vote for negative.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

| AFFIRMATIVE | POINTS | NEGATIVE | POINTS |
|-----------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
| Bonita Vista Gonzalez | Max = 30 | MSJ Puri | Max = 30 |
| Sabrina Gonzalez | <u>26</u> | Iyasha Puri | <u>28</u> |

The better debating was done by the Neg from Iyasha Puri
AFF or NEG TEAM OF CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Mary M. O'Keefe

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirm - Good Delivery, for topic of debate. - Clear & able to understand.

Neg - opened with a general question that was somewhat broad & general statement but to the point.

- The negative side was able to establish why the U.S. ~~ought~~ ^{should not} to extend same constitutional Due Process to non-citizens accused of terrorism because it strongly supported her value criterion of public safety & utilitarianism since other side would promote better interpretation method since it's development, & that the government is not equipped to deal in these cases. The affirmative tried to promote ~~Equality~~ equality of life as a means to use Due Process for non-citizens accused however, The negative does promote equality to life morally because the goal of "the what" allows equality & morally over