

OPEN LD

ROUND 5

Room: Loyola 137
Flight B: Start 1:15pm 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

Leland Hu, E

Max = 30

MSJ Paramasivan

Max = 30

Ethan Hu

28

Santhosh Paramasivan

27

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:

OK

Room: O Connor 110
Flight B: Start 1:15pm 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

MSJ Bisen

Max = 30

Ralo Alto Robertson

Max = 30

Yash Bisen

28.5

Will Robertson

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: MEHUL NAIK, EVHS.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF lost on multiple fronts.

Following International law argument requires that International Courts be used. AFF seemed to confuse International Court @ the HAGUE with the inherent conflict in Security Council. Due to this the contractual argument was lost by AFF. International law requires International Court that are ready now and will operate on a different basis vs. ~~to~~ US due process.

Morality argument was won by NEG as the inherent media bias when trial is in ~~the~~ ^{U.S.} ~~argument~~ prevents a fair trial argument was good. This was a unique argument.

Net benefit argument was even. AFF won on the soldiers argument, Neg won on the added cost of security.

Soft power argument was won by Neg as a clear example was provided (France abandoning Iraq/Israel) on self-interest vs. influence by soft power.

Both ~~deb~~ Contestants got great style points due to their assertiveness & confidence.

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	Westmont Keates	Max = 30
Raghu Dhara	<u>27</u>	Paula Keates	<u>25</u>

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

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

Signed: DB Peters

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Raghu
Strong case, and excellent summary of voted in last speech. Good speaking.

Paula
Nice speaking but the Aff's Alt's C2 and C3 were weak.

AFD
Glad to see the value resolved quietly. Neg. fails to provide explicit links to morality. Neg. arguments side-stick major issue of terrorism and focus on non-topical issues. Aff. show link btw morality and indefinite detention. Aff. has excellent response to Neg. C2. ~~and Aff.~~ Neg's standing offense is the targets on the backs of jurors, but Aff. outweighs. Good round.

Room: Loyola 132
Flight B: Start 1:15pm 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

Palo Alto Braun

Max = 30

Milpitas Garg

Max = 30

Noa Braun

28


Rakshit Garg

26

The better debating was done by the AFF from Noa Braun (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:

One of the best debates that I could watch. Both Noa & Rakshit both exhibited very good presenting & debating skills. Very hard for me to judge this one and I kind of feel for Rakshit that I had to give it to Noa by a thin margin. In the end Noa was able to edge just little ahead by clarity of thoughts, examples in support of her resolution. None the less Rakshit too did an amazing job. He should be given the credit too for presenting his stuff well. Need to deferral the couple's exam questions little better. But to summarize job well done by both. Keep it up.

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

Bishop O Dowd Clark
Graham Clark

POINTS

Max = 30

28

NEGATIVE

Palo Alto Huang
Ryan Huang

POINTS

Max = 30

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: Emily M. Purvis

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- you defined right as moral obligation too... I wrote it down
- your advocacy seemed to shift a little in the 1AR away from "my noncitizens with due process" to "do this in a military tribunal." this is sketchy & should have been clarified earlier if it really was your position

Neg

- you could work on your CX questions & strategy - instead of letting the aff re-explain his case the whole time, be a little more assertive
- great logical, intuitive responses

- great style of presentation - you are certainly perceptually dominant
- yikes, new responses in the 2AR "
- you DID drop the AC in the 1AR.... if "silence is consent," then ~~you~~ agree with the NC refutations...

(very close round - great job to both of you!)

Room: Parlor B
Flight B: Start 1:15pm or ASAP
Open Lincoln Douglas

5

~~Mangla, Mr.~~
CHANDRASEKHAR PUSARLA
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
Palo Alto Zheng	Max = 30	MSJ Lai	Max = 30
Austin Zheng	<u>28.05</u>	Ryan Lai	<u>28</u>

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

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

Signed: P. C. Sekher

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The Aff arguments clearly tied to the topic and laid down the various reasons. The Aff was able to answer all questions with clarity and examples. The Aff was able to show how Neg had contradicted himself in one of the arguments

The neg made a very good case why present methods have produced good intelligence information etc... was able to tie to the topic. ~~By~~ By agreeing to status quo, contradicted himself that military tribunals are OK when he does not advocate them.

Room: Benson 15
Flight B: Start 1:15pm 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

MSJ Calambur

Max = 30

Oakwood Mathur

Max = 30

Vivek Calambur

27

Shivani Mathur

27

The better debating was done by the AFF from MSJ Calambur
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:

RFD

This debate was finally won because the NEG's value of national security does not align \leq the VC of utilitarianism. AFF was able to hold case on rebuttals. In LD the value cannot be quantified, it is the VC where the impact is quantified.

Good Debate by both speakers.

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 Tummala

Max = 30

James Logan Ritchie

Max = 30

Vineet Tummala


24

Nathan Ritchie

26

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG won

The negative established value of saving lives and national security is more important than due process for few suspected terrorists

The affirmative provided some good examples on how not providing due process (e.g. Shohruh Khan) can create bad perceptim. However AFF gave an example that 9/11 was caused due to lack of due process for one non-citizen did not carry weight.

The negative established that even though some people may be tortured or wrongfully imprisoned, occurance are low due to USA laws and denying due process to terrorists protect lives.

I voted negative because NEG established that denying due process ~~help~~ to non-citizen terrorists help protect national security and saves lives

~~* soft power -> couldn't argue why it would be decreased~~

~~* Life is important than fair trial~~

~~* argument that that by denying fair process it would save life was not strong.~~

Room: O Connor 105
Flight B: Start 1:15pm or ASAP
Open Lincoln Douglas

5

Reykalin, Kyle

JOHN BORECZKY JAMES LOGAN

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 Young

Max = 30

MSJ Mittal

Max = 30

Bruce Young

29

Mudit Mittal

28.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from YOUNG,
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: NEG VALUE WAS THAT GOVERNMENT MORALITY MUST BE CONTRACTUAL, IN CROSS, NEG HAD TROUBLE WITH, OR DIDNT WANT TO ENUMERATE CONTRACTS THAT U.S. HAS WITH CITIZENS AND NON-CITIZENS. AFF RESPONDED WELL BY SHOWING THAT THE RESOLUTION WOULD ACTUALLY PROMOTE THE VALUE OF BOTH SIDES. THIS WAS VERY CLOSE AND COULD HAVE GONE EITHER WAY.

AFF: GOOD VOICE AND BODY LANGUAGE. HANDLED CROSS EXAMINATION VERY WELL, AND CRAFTED GOOD REBUTTALS. SHOULDN'T HAVE ARGUED AGAINST OWN FEASIBILITY OF IMPROVING VALUE.

NEG: PRETTY GOOD VOICE + BODY LANGUAGE - READ MORE THAN SEEMED NEEDED. ARGUMENT WAS WELL CRAFTED, BUT AFF ~~RE~~ COUNTERED 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

La Reina Draper

Max = 30

MSJ Fong

Max = 30

Kate Draper

26.5

Nathan Fong

26.5

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

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

Signed: A-Wee-Lee

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Negative won my vote because he presented a clear, logical case for why withholding public trial rights would be preferable from a national security standpoint, than extending all due process rights.

Affirmative did not address this key point.

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 Baldwin	Max = 30	Polytechnic Zhou	Max = 30
Tealanie Baldwin	27.9	Jimmy Zhou	26.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from Tealanie Baldwin - 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	NEG	CE	
<p>① Case evidence. - due process. - Non US citizen</p> <p>② Reduces terrorism - Intl relations during</p> <p>③ Abuses - AB-GB Policies are hindering</p> <p>④ Detention - - Criteria NS are not defined. - No ability to detain threat</p> <p>⑤ Due process</p>	<p>① Value of Life.</p> <p>② NS is paramount</p> <p>③ N, WMD weapons.</p> <p>④ Threats are ++</p> <p>⑤ Countries Coop. - war is fuzzy</p> <p>⑥ Due process constitutionally. - Ref.</p> <p>⑦ No option to detention.</p> <p>⑧ Procedural misconduct</p> <p>⑨ Value civil liberties Need to protect</p> <p>⑩ Intl coop.</p> <p>⑪ Increase terrorist recruitment.</p> <p>- Innocent people we have racial profin</p> <p>- Impact is larger</p> <p>- Due process in mem</p> <p>Terror.</p>	<p>Value - life. Criterion NS. Evidence for Nuclear</p> <p>AFF REB</p> <p>- Not protecting life - People have died AB, GB</p> <p>- Countries are not coop. - AB, GB</p> <p>- Why does it compromise NS ++</p> <p>- C3 does not make sense</p> <p>- C3 is misunderstood</p> <p>NEG Reb.</p> <p>- Value: Life is our rights can be regained.</p> <p>- Nuclear is stabl</p>	<p>- Legal due process: -- Don't solve brutality (pdic)</p> <p>- Released - due to bypass legal system</p> <p>- Does not prove due process will solve. get Intl support.</p> <p>- Value of life - NS.</p> <p>AFF - Rebuttal</p>

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 Mariscal

Max = 30

Harker Shah

Max = 30

Alexander Mariscal

26

Manan Shah

27

The better debating was done by the Neg from Harker Shah
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

— x —

Poison Torture.

Geneva Convention.

— x —

Proof of morality

Evidence of torture

Neg:

Cross

Guantanamo Bay

Morality

Military Tribunal.

— x —

National Security more important than Morality

Tribunal will work for society

Neg Wins.

Room: Loyola 136
Flight B: Start 1:15pm or ASAP
Open Lincoln Douglas

5

Singh, Mr.
La

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 Kannan

Max = 30

La Reina Sullivan

Max = 30

Deepti Kannan

~~20~~ 25

Kathleen Sullivan

~~20~~ 20

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Deepti: Some solid points

Kathleen: Too fast, little nervous

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 Gupta

Max = 30

Mountain View Hulett

Max = 30

Madhu Gupta

29

James Hulett

28.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from PALO ALTO (Madhu Gupta).
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

The aff did a good job on staty value & value criterion.

constitution & morality.

NEG:

All possible rights did presented a good defense of the stance.

Mani Subramani
 Evergreen
 Vally high
 School.

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 Sandhu

Jaisel Sandhu

POINTS

Max = 30

29

NEGATIVE

MSJ Chopra

Aditya Chopra

POINTS

Max = 30

28

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: A. Subramani

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff Case: Argued that it considered. Power of the human fight further our security. Soft power is better than hard power. Our citizens have an rights easily protected by other nations. In 12,000 detainees were held in Guantanamo Bay. Universal human rights.

Neg Case: Must protect every citizen. Argued that this is a root of terrorism. non-constitutional. Soft power is ineffective weapons. Smart power & diplomacy with other nations. Universal human rights is possible. Argued that target of soft power can endanger the process.

Aff Rebuttal: Not enough soft power. What?

Neg Rebuttal: Benefits of target killer outweighs loss. Citizens terrorist would be given due process because US obligation primary to citizen.

Aff Final: Univ. human rights. Soft power.

Room: O Connor 201
Flight B: Start 1:15pm or ASAP
Open Lincoln Douglas

5

MSJ-LD-02, MSJ-L

TUMM

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

Evergreen Shen

Max = 30

Russell Shen

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto Lau

Max = 30

Andrew Lau

29

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: T. Simkins

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Negative gave clear arguments on why non-citizens should not be given same rights as citizens and emphasized national security. Affirmative came back strong at the close but Neg wins by a narrow edge.

Room: O Connor 103
Flight B: Start 1:15pm 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

Palo Alto McNamara

Max = 30

MSJ Chawla

Max = 30

Addie McNamara

29

Shweta Chawla

28.5

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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: clearly laid out open. strong points made. good eye contacts. would prepare more supportive examples/evidences. good attack strategy.

NEG: quick reaction to catch opponent's weak point. good speech & eye contacts. good supportive examples. good timing control.

Both sides are strong & well performed.

Room: O Connor 107
Flight B: Start 1:15pm 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

Leland Liu

Max = 30

Palo Alto Zhang, K.

Max = 30

Stacy Liu

26

Kevin Zhang

27

The better debating was done by the NEG from Palo Alto Zhang
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 the sides used 'Justice' as the value that they based their position and it came down to who made the accurate determination of guilt. The Neg side ~~did~~ made arguments for a military tribunal while the Aff side cited ~~as~~ so the judicial system of USA. But the Aff side did not make strong arguments as to why that would provide better justice. Hence I choose Neg as the winner.

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 Naik	Max = 30	Bonita Vista Dawson	Max = 30
Akshay Naik	27.5	Imani Dawson	27.5

The better debating was done by the Neg from Bonita Vista
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:

Akshay - read from paper
Imani - read from paper

Cross examination - different style, akshay stronger, but neither really addressed ~~the~~ issues or improved on their ground

From all confusing data presented, Imani was able to humanize her cause in the 6 minute negative rebuttal -

Debate was very even

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

Palo Alto Parker

Max = 30

Coby Parker

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

James Logan Rahimi

Max = 30

Rod Rahimi

27

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: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative - Very good start with definitions. Affirmative team handled the cross-exam very well.

Negative: Good start with security as main point. But could not answer the ^{question on} level of secured cells for terror accused Non Citizen' within "due process" to stop influence/conversion theory.
He agrees that even Military Courts provide some "due process". That means he is agrees more on affirm.

Room: Benson 21
Flight B: Start 1:15pm or ASAP
Open Lincoln Douglas

5

~~Ratnam Freeman~~
Scott Borner

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	James Logan Narayannan	Max = 30
Jonathan Ngo	<u>29.1</u>	Ajijt Narayannan	<u>29.3</u>

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

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

Signed: Scott R Borner

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Negative asked effective question during cross, appears to have set up less a case that he would win if only (due process protection is not extended to accused terrorists)

Aff properly distinguishes accused terrorists from actual terrorists.

Meg speaks too quickly at some points, it can be hard to determine when he is trying to add emphasis

Aff's cross-exam ~~was~~ was effective, but negatives seemed more purposeful.

Meg did not ~~make~~ attempt to rebut the contention that there are negative consequences to dehumanizing terrorists (and suspected terrorists), e.g. we become like terrorists

Aff ~~is~~ conflates suspected terrorists with lead non-suspects in done strikes, but neg did not follow up

Meg came back and was able to use the concession he made about a single due process protection he was able to pull out in cross-ex

Aff did not address the negatives contention that courts with due process increase terrorism because they are limited in the type of evidence they can use, e.g. exclusion of hearsay evidence.

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	Bonita Vista Gonzalez	Max = 30
Sagar Rao	<u>28.9</u>	Sabrina Gonzalez	<u>28.8</u>

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

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

Signed: Amitabh Puri

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Excellent delivery and cross examination by both sides. Both sides made their cases very well but the key argument that won it for Affirmative was that "It is more fair to treat both citizens and non-citizens by the same standards and systems". The negative side did not rebut this fully by showing why the criminal justice system's use would put the U.S. citizens at risk.

Room: Sobrato C-D
Flight B: Start 1:15pm or ASAP
Open Lincoln Douglas

5

Hull, Mrs.
Schetzbaum
Jammie

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 Ho	Max = 30	Olive Children Jen	Max = 30
Jeffrey Ho	28	Jesse Jen	27

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

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

Signed: Jammie Schetzbaum

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Jeffrey- Need to link soft power to morality better. Choppy 4 minute speech, work on pace.

Jesse-clear speaker. Value unclear. Realism? - maybe try using Social Contract theory? That almost sounds like what you are arguing.

RFD - Neg's value was unclear and vague. Negs contention 2^o was non unique. Military court could also be biased, possibly even more. AFF had a strong case concerning torture leading to abuse linking to morality value and leading to an increase in terrorism (with no due process and/or fair treatment). Not a clear link in AFF's second contention & morality but he wins based on Cont 1 & morality. Good Debate.