

OPEN LD

ROUND 5

Room: Sobrato C-D
Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP
Open Lincoln Douglas

5

~~Hull, Mrs.~~
Jammie Schletzbaum

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 Nayak

Max = 30

Bishop O Dowd Hawkins

Max = 30

Akaash Nayak

27

Anna Hawkins

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from Bishop O Dowd Hawkins
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Jammie Schletzbaum

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Akaash - Speed was okay until the end of 4 minute speech. Pace yourself.

Good answers in cross ex. - Look at judge during cross ex.

Choppy 4 minute speech, good job covering neg case.

Anna - Spent too much time on court case arguing 6th Amendment and ran out of time to argue AFF case. Look at judge during cross ex.

Good job in 6min speech. - Good eye contact & voter points.

RFD! AFF's case seemed inconsistent, He should not have agreed to 6th Amendment statement during cross ex. Also, I used Negs U. & VC and using Social Contract means that the US has priority to its own citizens. Neg said Ind. def. was effective and AFF did not refute this adequately.

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 Q-Tran

Max = 30

Palo Alto Haris

Max = 30

Louis Q-Tran

~~28~~ 28

Anish Haris

~~28~~ 28.5

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

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

Signed: Amitabh Jain

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both sides made persuasive arguments for their positions with the affirmative case based on morality while the negative side based their case on national security. I voted for the negative case since Haris made a persuasive case that the govt's job is to provide the greatest good for its citizens and it does so most effectively through the use of special military courts which protect ~~the~~ classified information. The Affirmative side did not make the case for why using these special courts is immoral since morality was the basis of their case.

Room: Benson 21
Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP
Open Lincoln Douglas

5

~~Ratnam, Freeman~~

Scott Bortner

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

MSJ Puri

Max = 30

Dominick Mortarotti

29.3

Iyasha Puri

29.2

The better debating was done by the AFF from Bishop O Dowd
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Scott Bortner

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff defined constitutional due process, a useful step in controlling the limits of the debate.
 Aff had a good summation in his opening, repeating his 3 contentions in an integrated argument.
 Neg made good use of cross-exam response in her rebuttal of arguments.
 Neg had a good explanation of the value and value criterion (British philosopher quotes were used).
 Aff made ~~me~~ was able to pull out that neg did not dispute that his ~~a~~ subset of 4 constitutional protections were not problematic.
 Aff failed to refute Neg's all contentions → but this was a weak contention.
 Neg did not effectively address the slippery slope argument.
 Aff choice of limiting the constitutional protections to only a set of 4, the 4 that were in the Hamdi case was effective.
 I was confused by Neg's argument that courts and military tribunals wrongly convict people. I did not see that as supporting her case.

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

MSJ Wadhera

Max = 30

Karuna Wadhera

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

James Logan Wong

Max = 30

John Wong

26

The better debating was done by the Aff from MST
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: Affirmative team provided a strong value criteria. Bringing checks & Balances in debate was a good point for long term vision. Her cross-exam was weak but Neg was not able to come out with better argument to win it.

Negative: Started good but was not able to provide statistical evidences. & was not able to argue on Checks and Balances to not become a Utahite style gov.

Room: Loyola 135
Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP
Open Lincoln Douglas

5

Danielle Morse
~~Nagakumar, Jines~~

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 Hashmi | Max = 30 | Douglas Frost | Max = 30 |
| Noah Hashmi | <u>27</u> | Andy Frost | <u>28</u> |

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

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

Signed: Danielle Morse

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative - Solid points as to why military trials are not effective enough to try terrorist. Could use more up to date cases to make points.

Negative - Counter argued affirmatives points well. Had examples of threats to national security and good sources to back them up.

I voted for the negative because he argued national security will be more effective if we do not grant due process to non citizens. The Affirmative failed to counter argue this and did not drop the negatives contentions.

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

Evergreen Sinnarkar

Max = 30

Dhruv Walia


28.5

Violet Sinnarkar

27.5

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Dhruv - very good delivery, good eye contact & gesture
very very assertive, in cross examination
excellent cross examination

Violet - Very good delivery, eye ~~and~~ contact & gesture
did not do so well in cross examination
could have / should have use prep time for rebuttal

Room: O Connor 107
Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP
Open Lincoln Douglas

5

Boreczky, John

DEGLURKAR, ANI
EVHS

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 Sreekumar

Max = 30

Harker Lee

Max = 30

Sanjay Sreekumar

27

Matthew Lee

24

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

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

Signed: AB Deglurkar

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both Aff & Neg made their opening statements well. But the Neg team's rebuttals and lack of evidence for rebuttals was weak. Even though Neg ~~offer~~ quoted many sources for ~~their~~ its stand, the Aff side questioned ^{the} evidence which was not provided. The Aff side had a clear view of the debate and a convincing way to put it across, while the Neg did not address Aff's points.

Room: O Connor 103
Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP
Open Lincoln Douglas

5

Talla, Theja

Xu, Kai

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 Singh

Max = 30

MSJ Kalakuntla

Max = 30

Akriti Singh

28

Tej Kalakuntla

26

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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: statement is clearly laid out. loud & clear voice good eye contact. list of examples to support examples. Better prepared. Could do better in cross exam. good closing.

Neg: able to catch weak point during cross exam quickly. less eye contact, good argument, good timing control. need to react faster. less supportive evidences

Room: O Connor 201
Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP
Open Lincoln Douglas

5

MSJ-LD-02, MSJ-L

TUMH

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 Dong

Max = 30

Leland Hu, R

Max = 30

Patrick Dong

27

Rebecca Hu

28

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

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

Signed: J. Brinkes

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

General feedback: do not use distracting devices or sounds and avoid reading from computer screen and please look at the judge as much as possible.

Negative could not ~~prove that~~ give convincing arguments as to why non-citizens should not be treated like citizens even though Neg speech was better. Affirmative was consistent in defending why its values preservation was important.

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

Palo Alto Rao

Sama Rao

POINTS

Max = 30

29

NEGATIVE

Diablo Valley Mishra

Archit Mishra

POINTS

Max = 30

30

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

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

Signed: Archit Mishra

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff open & Definition: Moral Obligation. Accused only not present hence
 this process is the only way. Universal Human Rights. Denying this
 creates arbitrary distinction. Rights given rights to non-citizens will
 not be citizenry but dependent as well.

Neg Open: Ought moral obligation - US has not agreed to this.
 Moral Rights of human kind
 Neg Open: Regulate borders & Not moral obligation. ^{only political obligation} ^{territorially related}
 Moral Rights of human kind. ^{which territoriality cannot}
 bind to refuse such rights. ^{territorial obligation}

XXXX Aff: In the name of National Security we do not want
 to risk lives of all people of the world. We will refuse
 by Neg.

Aff rebuttal: Accused only not present. If you are a citizen trusted
 citizens cannot be citizen. National Security cannot be only defense
 because govt can kill POW, Rights get taken away.

Neg rebuttal: Non-citizens do not have all rights as US citizens
 govt will not kill POW. And present to show citizens will not
 be a risk to national security.

Aff Closing: Now we would not see POWs just as citizens,
 who can question process.

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

James Logan Lee

Max = 30

Keshav Thvar

29.5

Jia Hui Lee

28

The better debating was done by the AFF from MTN VIEW/KESHAV THVAR
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: started by defining value & criteria by looking into maximizing benefits. Negative due to reality which demonstrated ineffective remedy if we avoid 'Due process rights'.

Effect of ~~do~~ alienation of partner nations.
Used 4 contentions effectively -

Neg

you should focus on Value maximizing benefits and refute it as not orthogonal to 'equal rights'.
you should look @ reciprocity of treatment as a principle.

Room: Loyola 136
Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP
Open Lincoln Douglas

5

Singh, 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

Diablo Valley Bhargava

Max = 30

Leland Loftis

Max = 30

Rohan Bhargava

23

Cameron Loftis

25

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

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Diablo - give enough information
Leland - good example & good points

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 | Saratoga Munukutla | Max = 30 |
| Rachelle Fishbin | <u>25</u> | Venkat Munukutla | <u>28</u> |

The better debating was done by the NEG from Saratoga Munukutla.
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

Key terms explained.
Help from other countries
Fair trial for everyone

—x—

Evidence of Human Rights Violation

—x—

Guantanamo Bay civil rights

—x—

National Security & Morality

—x—

Evidence of torture.

Negative has more convincing points.

Neg.

Cross-exam

Osama-bin-Laden killing

Right/Wrong.

Human Rights - rule played.

Morality.

No evidence.

—x—

Capital Punishment

—x—

Counter terrorism.

Neg Wins.

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

St Francis Chen

Max = 30

Derek Hsiao

26.9

Alex Chen

28.1

The better debating was done by the NEG from Alex Chen - 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

- ① National Security
 - Drives away investm
 - Ineffective / mod.
- ② GB - caused more terror. AG - torture eliminate torture
- ③ Moral rights
 - US detainee policy
 - Other nations picky
 - tab to combat T2.
- ④ Speedy/fair trial
 - Due process - fundam
 - ental rights.
 - Monstrocities & mis
 - foolc gap with laptop.

NEG

- ① Morality Intl. justice.
- ② mega terror is global 9/11 - 3000 ICC
- ③ Criminal justice system - 1/10 rape
- ④ Malony-Duhm Decrease terrorist recruits. / - GB detention policy will find more support
- AFF
- ⑤ Immorality of bombing. ICC solves these cases - Agreeing with C2
- C3 → Negate.

CI - How is global terrorism. Mega terror attack global threat-

AFF Rebuttal

- ① What is ICC's plan?
- ② Values - If you don't get life - US Non US choice.
- ③ Not every crisis global terrorism.
- ④ US courts have high standards.
- ⑤ ICC is not sufficient
- ⑥ Terrorism fight is not a war

NEG Rebuttal

- ① Voting
- ② Delegitimizing
- ③ Need Intl support
- ④ Concedes ICC
- ⑤ AG, GB expc?
- ⑥ How to fight bias against Jun
- ⑦ Support Intl system by ICC.
- NC.
- Defensive.

- CE
- ① What is evidence to intermed trials & terrorist. - Neg.
 - ② Multi lateral
 - ③ Spirit of constitution for Non-citizens.

- CE
- ① Value. US has same moral obligation
 - ② States need not be held same morality vs person

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 Prasad | Max = 30 | St Francis Ratnam | Max = 30 |
| Abhinav Prasad | <u>27</u> | Sheryl Ratnam | <u>27</u> |

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

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

Signed: Lim Wee-Lee

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Congratulations on a well-articulated & spirited debate!

On balance, affirmative made a stronger case that extension of due process rights better promotes soft power and reduces negative consequences of the status quo.

The negative needed to address what adverse outcome would result from extending such rights to non-citizens vs. citizens.

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 Desai, A.

Max = 30

Palo Alto Takeuchi

Max = 30

Anuj Desai

29

Rick Takeuchi

28

The better debating was done by the AFF from DESAI
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: AFF ARGUMENT WAS THAT MORALITY FOR NATIONS RESIDES IN INTERNATIONAL LAW. NEG ARGUMENT WAS THAT LEGAL OBLIGATIONS ARE MORE IMPORTANT THAN MORALITY. THE AFF SIDE WAS ABLE TO GET NEG TO CONCEDE ENOUGH POINTS - MILITARY COURTS CAN BE MADE BETTER, AND VARIOUS "SAVE LIFE" POINTS, THAT THE AFF SIDE MET BOTH VALUE CRITERIA BETTER.

AFF: GOOD SPEAKING PACE. OPENING SPEECH WAS READ, BUT REBUTTALS HAD BETTER ENGAGEMENT + VOICE/HAND PUNCTUATION. CRAFTED THE REBUTTALS WELL TO WIN ROUND.

NEG: SPOKE QUITE QUICKLY BUT DID A GOOD JOB OF SPEAKING, RATHER THAN READING NOTES. ANSWERING A "IF I SHOW X, DO I WIN" WITH ANYTHING OTHER THAN "NO, AND HERE IS WHY...." IS A BAD IDEA, BUT THAT WAS SMALL.

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

Palo Alto Fee

Max = 30

Joebert Rosal

27

Shannon Fee

~~20~~ 25

The better debating was done by the AFF from Joebert Rosal
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 WIN

~~AFF~~

The AFF established value of human ~~right~~ rights as paramount and established its case that by not providing due process is slippery slope and incite more terrorism since other countries consider USA as hypocrite when it comes to following international laws

The Negative clearly stated that states paramount duty is to protect its citizens and established ~~value~~ a national security as value.

~~Cross Examination~~. Negative provided contention that fair process can ~~keep~~ only happen in civilian court which hurts national security. Negative tried to establish that targeted killing (e.g. Osama bin Laden) protects National security which is convincing argument. However AFF challenged if that can be justified for all non-citizen terrorists without due process.

AFF provided data that only about 4% cases are terrorists and denial of due process impacts remaining 96% of innocent people.

I voted AFF because of argument that protecting human rights by providing due process to all individuals would help in improving USA's soft power, perception in world and hence reduce terrorism which would save lives.

Room: Benson 15
Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP
Open Lincoln Douglas

5

Laud, Amar
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

Evergreen Tallapragada

Max = 30

Bishop O Dowd Nouri

Max = 30

Amit Tallapragada

26

Koosha Nouri

✓ 28

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

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

Signed: A. Shah

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

DEF

This round was won by NEG on Value & VC grounds. The NEG's value of Social Contract & Maximizing Safety superseded AFF's value of Morality & Maximizing life. NEG did a good job with rebuttals. AFF should spend & use time effectively to argue and show understanding of criteria vs. getting distracted with technicalities of LD.

Great Debate by both!

Room: Parlor B
Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP
Open Lincoln Douglas

5

~~Mangla, Mr.~~
CHAN DRASEKHAR PUSARLA

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL EVHS

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 Wang

Max = 30

Mountain View Bystrom

Max = 30

Christine Wang

29.5

Kyle Bystrom

30

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

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

Signed: P. C. Sekhel

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The neg was able to create a framework called Social Contract and describe why non-citizens don't get rights. Tied all of his arguments to the topic very well and simplified the debate.

The aff did an excellent job of presenting arguments and linked them to the topic. She was able to clearly articulate with examples. ~~to~~

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 Zhang

George Zhang

POINTS

Max = 30

28

NEGATIVE

Palo Alto Moraes-Liu

Juliana Moraes-Liu

POINTS

Max = 30

29.5

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: Emily M. Purvis

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- good CX questions/strategy - way to press on evidence
- 1/3 statistics she doesn't have
- you literally don't impact any of your points back to the standards, which is why you lost: the debate isn't "federal courts vs. military tribunals" in general, but specifically in the context of human rights

Neg

- great CX of your opponent
- great coverage of the AC in the NC
- good weighing & crystallization

both of you are talking about human rights, the morality/justice debate is irrelevant & wasted a LOT of both of your speeches

Room: Loyola 132
Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP
Open Lincoln Douglas

5 Omohundro-McNult

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 Rajvanshy

Max = 30

Leland Kim

Max = 30

Raghav Rajvanshy

20

Yi Youn Kim

25

The better debating was done by the NEG from YI YOON KIM (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:

Yi Youn was able to put together the points, & contentions in a more organized way. The presentation skills were very well used in putting forward the argument. She stuck to her contentions & value proposition and was able to defend those well. She could also challenge the opponents values and contentions effectively.

Raghav had lots of information that he had gathered and presented in defense of his claim. If he can present those better (speak slowly and clearly) he could be a very effective debater. He was good in challenging some of opponents contentions but need to take those debates to the end with well put points.

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 | Saratoga Krishna | Max = 30 |
| Kendra Marsh | 28 | Rohith Krishna | 26 |

The better debating was done by the Aff from James Logan Marsh
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:

Kendra
Ch is strong, I buy the consequentialist argument, but poor A2 nuclear war.

Rohith
could have done a better job defending your voting/community link in CX1. I don't buy your evidence on no human dignity violations.

RFD
I vote Aff. on the obligation within a community, gitmo and A2 to Neg arguments on morality and voting. Neg wins that nuclear war is topical, but Aff. outweighs by showing tangible human rights violations.

Room: O Connor 110
Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP
Open Lincoln Douglas

5

Alamzai, Mujda
Naik, MEHUL

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

EVHS

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 Hari

Max = 30

Alex Warner

26.5

Anant Hari

26.5

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

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

Signed: Mehul Naik, EVHS

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both contestants were hesitant and did not address their opponent's case very well and failed to pick up on a number of soft points made by their opponent. Palo Alto ~~Contestant~~ won based on soft power (no counter to form Neg) Moral arguments were won by AFF (internment example, no good counter from Neg) Aff won the social contract (Citizen vs non-citizen) due to the argument on social contract not voiding due process. In general, this was a very narrow decision. Both contestants had good points in their own case, but, did not properly address their opponents case.

Room: Loyola 137
Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP
Open Lincoln Douglas

5

Velamuri, Madhu

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 Natarajan

Max = 30

Mikhail Meller

30

Arvindh Natarajan

29

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:

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

ORAL. TOUGH ROUND TO JUDGE. THEY KNOW HOW DIFFICULT IT WAS FOR ME TO CHOOSE.