

OPEN LS

ROUND 2

Room: O Connor 107
Flight B: Start 5:45
Open Lincoln Douglas

2

Glenn, Kelsey

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Bishop O Dowd Baldwin	Max = 30	Oakwood Mathur	Max = 30
Tealanie Baldwin	<u>28.5</u>	Shivani Mathur	<u>28.5</u>

The better debating was done by the NEG from OAKWOOD
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 insufficiently extends offense; offense they had lacked an imp. to the collapsed util standard; NEG's preventative analysis controls link to terror prevention.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
James Logan Narayannan	Max = 30	Westmont Young	Max = 30
Ajjit Narayannan	<u>28.8</u>	Bruce Young	<u>28.5</u>

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

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

Signed: Marie Litton

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: Aff

Ob. 1 citizens v. non-citizens Ob. 2 Morality, terrorism must be reported - leads to 3rd world war. C1; international cooperation; coalition is better if people are trusted account to an rule. Cooperation is necessary. C2 Torture leads to more terrorism. C3 Fed courts are fair & secure & solve above problems.

CROSS: Clarity questions on Aff's contentions.

NEG: Consequential. Juries create faulty version. Juries can release terrorists. Juries can be tempered with - can we release terrorists? (Serves my also condemn the innocent; JURY protection unworkable. Do men justify the ends; Examine the laws. Torture, red herring. CROSS: Juries can release; juries are more likely, let people walk free. Aff makes point that Neg's contention is re juries is contradictory; Aff refutes. Aff

Rebut/Neg. rebut/Aff rebut → Clash for more recent proof. Mark proven assertions w/ Neg is 1) that the US does what it wants and it should a 2) that the jury system is hopelessly flawed. Aff needs to rebut these two elements; Aff asserts that jury rule is assertion is contradictory ~~at that point~~ A

Comments: Both ~~contentions~~ Aff & Neg argued clearly & succinctly. Aff's ~~contentions~~ contentions were well supported & reasoned. He slipped a little when suggesting that Neg jury info contradicted itself (it was two sides of same coin), but overall his points carried the debate. The Neg ~~contentions~~ contentions were delivered smoothly, with a casual, even humorous tone which I liked. Overall, though, the idea that the US can do whatever it wants became it can do what it wants is not as persuasive an idea as the Aff's contentions.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

MSJ Chawla

Max = 30

Saratoga Kannan

Max = 30

Shweta Chawla

29

Deepti Kannan

29

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

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I thought you both did an excellent job of not only debating the big picture V/VC / Contentions, but also the finer points. For example ICCPR vs Geneva and whether or not they were applicable, similar for SDPT. You definitely stretch my ability to judge on these finer points.

Both cases + rebuttals were extremely good.

Besides perhaps being slightly more persuaded by the Aff case, the one thing that swayed me to Aff was the point where Neg claimed Aff dropped the point about US being unilateral + not needing coop, ~~and~~ and that this falls all of Aff's case. I'd agree that probable C_{2,3,4} would be dropped, but not C₁, and Aff was still able to give some support that coop ~~is~~ is necessary.

Great debate, + exceptional preparation!

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL


11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Bonita Vista Rosal	Max = 30	MSJ Bisen	Max = 30
Joebert Rosal	<u>30</u>	Yash Bisen	<u>28</u>

The better debating was done by the Aff from Bonita Vista 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's - case is very rhetorically pleasing but could/would benefit from being more concise
- I feel like the AC needs more focus, the framework is very broad.
- good coverage in CAR but I'd like to see more of your C2 since it very directly links into your framework

- your case is of a priori (before experience)
↳ your case says ought requires can which requires real-world experience to determine capability
this off cannot be a priori
- I really don't understand the link between high case loads and/or court clog leading to ↑ immigration
↳ it seems the real impact is people caught for illegal immigration have to wait longer for trials
↳ this argument would require police/border patrol saying "well the courts are clogged lots stop arresting people."
- I NR the link in your DA is really weak especially when you do respond to aff arguments that courts will clog b/c there are only a few terrorist trials

Aff answers back DA. by showing courts will not be clogged & then shows that extending DPP alters global perceptions & terror. Whether I look to a Morality or feasibility framework the aff is winning

Room: Engineering 305
Flight B: Start 5:45
Open Lincoln Douglas

2

Velamuri, Madhu
Zeng, Dewan

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Bishop O Dowd Nouri	Max = 30	MSJ Nayak	Max = 30
Koosha Nouri	<u>27</u>	Akaash Nayak	<u>26</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Nouri
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:

Both debaters are well-prepared, but spoke passionately about their cases.

Mr. Nouri had a stronger stance in linking examples and articulating the value criteria.

Mr. Nayak also did a good job!

Room: O Connor 110
Flight B: Start 5:45
Open Lincoln Douglas

2

Kataria, Seema
Krishna, Shaila Lal

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
La Reina Draper	Max = 30	Harker Rao	Max = 30
Kate Draper	<u>29</u>	Sagar Rao	<u>29.5</u>

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

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

Signed: Shaila Varudev (Krishna)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both sides were excellent. Neg took the framework by linking the criterion to the value in clear terms. Neg was able to counter aff's arguments very effectively. Neg's argument ~~that~~ that proving someone guilty and detaining them would have the same effect as detaining them before establishing guilt in the context of terrorist recruitment was very convincing and took away from aff's main argument on terrorist recruitment.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
James Logan Marsh	Max = 30	Palo Alto Gupta	Max = 30
Kendra Marsh	<u>28.4</u>	Madhu Gupta	<u>28.7</u>

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

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

Signed: Rajani H

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: Good contentions, ~~as~~ defended well, cross exam well answered. should improve on rebuttals.

NEG: Good contentions, defended well, Good rebuttals on presenting cross exam - well answered. Needs to improve conclusion

~~NEG~~ argued more for

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

MSJA-04

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Evergreen Sinnarkar

Max = 30

Mountain View Hulett

Max = 30

Violet Sinnarkar

28

James Hulett

26

The better debating was done by the AFF from Violet
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 Violet and James did a great job debating.

Violet was very strong during cross-examinations.

Violet & James both have value as morality. James' value criterion was cost benefit analysis, for which his supporting arguments were weak. James was not able to contradict Violet's arguments around his value criterion.

James gave some examples around candy bar and bus stop buildings, which he retracted when questioned by Violet for their relevance.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

James Logan Ritchie

Max = 30

Nathan Ritchie

27

James Logan

evergreen HS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Evergreen Shen

Max = 30

Russell Shen

28

evergreen HS

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

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

Signed: Tyler [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Decision on moral framework.

NEG lost point no point advocating for G. Bay but won in ↓ in National Security and that the war on terror has not been won.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012


Jim Zhang
Palo Alto High

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
MSJ Natarajan	Max = 30	Bonita Vista Dawson	Max = 30
Arvindh Natarajan	<u>28</u>	Imani Dawson	<u>26</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Arvindh Natarajan
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 did great on this debate, both gave strong presentation and defance on their points. AFF had good eye contact, NEG didn't. NEG needs to gather more solid data to support her argument. AFF asked good questions.

Room: Nobli B
Flight B: Start 5:45
Open Lincoln Douglas

2

DeBettencourt, M
Purvis, E (Presentation)

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Mountain View Bystrom	Max = 30	James Logan Wong	Max = 30
Kyle Bystrom	<u>28</u>	John Wong	<u>29</u>

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

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

Signed: Trinity G. [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- great voice tone/modulation during speeches
- focus more on concrete responses to your opponent's arguments

Neg

- great eye contact/speaking style
- cool alternative/case

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted: Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

Diablo Valley Vu
Alex Vu

POINTS

Max = 30

NEGATIVE

MSJ Puri

Iyesha Puri

POINTS

Max = 30

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

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

Signed: E. Helle

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

↓
No show 6:48 pm.
MSJ Puri..

Room: Nobli C
Flight B: Start 5:45
Open Lincoln Douglas

2

McMahon, Bridget
~~Nguyen, Joseph~~

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Palo Alto Parker	Max = 30	MSJ Hari	Max = 30
Coby Parker	<u>28.5</u>	Anant Hari	<u>28</u>

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

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

Signed: lmcMahon

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams have clearly extensively researched many caveats and aspects of this topic and were impressively prepared.

In conceding during cross-ex that laws are the same as morality, the debate took on an increased importance re: values and value criterion. perhaps the neg. can introduce point about laws as manifested morals earlier or?

additionally, aff's contention || (slippery slope of denied rights to noncitizens resulting in denied rights of citizens) was dropped -

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

James Logan Q-Tran

Max = 30

Louis Q-Tran

27.9

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland Kim

Max = 30

Yi Youn Kim

28.1

The better debating was done by the aff from Louis Q Tran
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: KM

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This group I enjoyed a lot. Both side presented their case well. However, for argumentation, affirmative proved a good point, humanity should be protected not only citizen but also non-citizens.

Room: Arts 135
Flight B: Start 5:45
Open Lincoln Douglas

Pachauri, Shalin

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

*Wei Wang
St. Francis*


11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Diablo Valley Bhargava	Max = 30	Palo Alto Rao	Max = 30
Rohan Bhargava	<u>29</u>	Sama Rao	<u>26</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Rohan Bhargava
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: * logical & articulate
* adaptable: pick up contradictions easily quickly*

*NEG: * retreat from own arguments by introducing contradictions
e.g. "move military tribunal overseas" to justify it.*

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto Robertson

Max = 30

Will Robertson

26

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker Lee

Max = 30

Matthew Lee

22

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

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

Signed: [Signature] (Piyush Shah)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

	<u>W</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>M</u>
A 6 (4:30) N 3 (11:30) N 7 (7) A 3 (2) A 10 (5) N 6 (6?) A 3	Defn value -> keep vs. avoid. Accused curbin counts. Terrorism duress Just's counts/rules 2009-2011 100% terrorist suit to jail Greatest net benefit for everyone.			(Saves life for all) -> M-W def. 1. Public Trials - Am exhibit life endanger civilians - Evid. -> - Detainees Torture (Not True) - life most important - Info availability

	<u>W</u>	<u>M</u>
Anal.	o o o o	o o o o
Refut	o o o o	o o o
cross exam.	o o o o	o o o
evid.	o o o o	o o o o
cog.	o o o o	o o o o
believed	o o o o	o o o o
Total	<u>26</u>	<u>22</u>

(2:37)

Room: Daly 103
Flight B: Start 5:45
Open Lincoln Douglas

2

Hoque, Mr.

JCh

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
MSJ Lai	Max = 30	Palo Alto Hashmi	Max = 30
Ryan Lai	<u>25</u>	Noah Hashmi	<u>27</u>

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: Katie Slosson

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

win is based on criterion of morality and who decreases suffering and death.
both sides dropped ~~case~~ the Aff case
Neg/ Aff needed to state which point they are addressing b/c it was hard to follow
just based on what was being said. GO POINT BY POINT!

Neg -

- use more transition
- you sound bored

Aff -

- good eye contact
- good use of cards

Room: O Connor 102
Flight B: Start 5:45
Open Lincoln Douglas

2

~~Rahman, Amreen~~
KANNAN, SHANT

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
MSJ Desai, A.	Max = 30	Palo Alto McNamara	Max = 30
Anuj Desai	29	Addie McNamara	29

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

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

Signed: Shant S

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both cases were well read, good cross ex by AFF. NEG wins this round as she defended her VC better and I felt her VC better tied to the value and the resolution. National Security should take precedence over International Law. NEG defended her case well. AFF's response that we don't really know was a little weak as NEG did give a concrete example. AFF also did not respond to NEG's C Subpoint B. NEG also had good responses to AFF's case and won AFF's C3.

Room: Daly 106
Flight B: Start 5:45
Open Lincoln Douglas

2

~~Aggarwal, Bereni~~
Chopra, Meenu

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Palo Alto Ho	Max = 30	Evergreen Tallapragada	Max = 30
Jeffrey Ho	<u>27</u>	Amit Tallapragada	<u>28</u>

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

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

Signed: Meenu

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF was able to defend ~~the~~ the case much better. CX from both opponents were really good. They had same value criteria. The point of cyber terrorism ^{from NEG} was little confusing with respect to the topic of debate. I felt it did not build on his case. Though Amit (NEG) was a much better speaker, Jeffrey (AFF) did a much better job defending and CXing the opponent.

Room: Daly 317
Flight B: Start 5:45
Open Lincoln Douglas

2.

Schwing, Emily

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Polytechnic Zhou	Max = 30	St. Francis Chen	Max = 30
Jimmy Zhou	<u>27</u>	Alex Chen	<u>25</u>

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Reason for Decision:

-The Neg did a good job present the case but they did not argue for the true resolution. They were for it but in a different manner. So therefore the Affirmative has received my vote for this case. They were able to demonstrate that the resolution was already accepted by both sides and the aff supported the case w/ much better hard evidence. The Neg used assumptions during the last rebuttal as well.

Room: Kenna 304
Flight A: Start 5:00
Open Lincoln Douglas

2

MUNIRA SHAHNAZ
Magan, Mr.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Diablo Valley Mishra	Max = 30	James Logan Lee	Max = 30
Archit Mishra	<u>27</u>	Jia Hui Lee	<u>24</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: M. Shaheen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The Affirmative shows better reasons with data and reference, also his rebuttal is better.

The negative cross exam ~~was~~ ^{needs} little improvement, also needs more reference & data

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto Moraes-Liu

Max = 30

Milpitas Garg

Max = 30

Juliana Moraes-Liu

28.5

Rakshit Garg

28.7

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

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

Signed: _____

Meenu

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This was a very close debate. Both AFF and NEG had really strong cases & arguments. AFF ~~was~~ very clearly articulated her case but NEG had better cross examination & rebuttal. NEG was able to address all the points made by AFF. Both of them are really good speakers. I would recommend NEG working on his case a little more to make it little simpler & shorter.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Palo Alto Sandhu	Max = 30	MSJ Dhara	Max = 30
Jaisel Sandhu	<u>27.5</u>	Raghu Dhara	<u>27.0</u>

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NOTES AFF

Def of right → is the strict definition you could have found

- morality ← upgrades (Dropped)
- universal human rights
- This is a premise

1) holdin up rights (soft power)
 2) Builds up an image
 3) enhance capacity to battle terrorist
 4) International support

Did you define this
 → Women legal point
ICCPR
 ↑
 Legal obligated to follow
CJPA (1986)
 ↑
 Legal against the 1995 (date)

↑ soft power = public safety Regular Courts

NOTES NEG

X

- individual rights (universal rights)
- Biggest threat → must have to have morals
- value → national security → You need this to have morals
- Critic: min terror threats

1) Over processing
 a) sent info → base 1 example (Assumption) → 6 base example
 b) breeds more terrorism

- Mega terrorist → he do not know who they are (them)
 → better to have them drunk

- Prison commission → separate prisons

Reason for Decision

- I voted Affirmative because they were able to support and back up their main points. They also did a good job w/ the cross-exams well and was able to find the flaws in the speech

- I did not vote negative b/c they made assumptions and the examples were not current as well as strong as the aff. Although they were able to provide hard #3 they did not back up the argument very strongly.

Room: O Connor 102
Flight A: Start 5:00
Open Lincoln Douglas

2

Rahman, Amreen
KANNAN, SHANTI

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Lynbrook Dong

Max = 30

Leland Hu, E

Max = 30

Patrick Dong

28

Ethan Hu

30

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

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

Signed: Shanti

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: As AFF, you need to uphold the resolution. By your IAR, you almost were very muddled and practically gave up the round. Even if you have never heard of the special advocate model, you should have got some info in cross-ex. Although you tried to correct in IAR.

NEG wins this round. He was extremely fluent, passionate and very clearly laid out his case and arguments. Response to AFF's CI wasn't totally accurate as he focused on 'Int'l. Law' instead of 'Int'l. relations' but AFF did not refute this IAR. AFF's refutation was weak because he could still have tried to focus on re-affirming his case more strongly and say why that was better than NEG's alternate proposal.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Olive Children Jen
Jesse Jen

Max = 30
27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto Huang
Ryan Huang

Max = 30
29

The better debating was done by the NEG from Palo Alto Huang
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 constructive Strong case, well argued. No need to hedge on cross X, go ahead and be confident in your case + argue for it.

Neg constructive Strong case - good evidence. Good clash + answering of aff's case.

Aff rebuttal Good clash + answering of neg case. Pace yourself to get to all of your points. You repeated yourself a few times (talking about backlash) and didn't get much of a chance to extend or elaborate on your own case.

Neg rebuttal You had good clash, and strong arguments for your case + against opponent. Feel free to elaborate on your case or to introduce more evidence with extra time at the end of the round, or end early. Repeating your already stated arguments does nothing to help your case.

Aff 2nd rebuttal Many of your arguments were repeats of arguments in 1st rebuttal. I'd like to see your arguments evolve to address neg rebuttal more.

Aff Dropped several contentions, therefore, I judged on Negatives value + value criteria, leading to a negative win.

Room: Daly 103
Flight A: Start 5:00
Open Lincoln Douglas

2

Hoque, Mr.

SCN

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Westmont Fishbin	Max = 30	MSJ Rajvanshy	Max = 30
Rachelle Fishbin	<u>28</u>	Raghav Rajvanshy	<u>24</u>

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

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

Signed: Katie Hagan

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff carried more points across and supported points

- very poised and good speaking style

Neg did not address some points and did not give enough back up. When solvency of own plan was brought up, he was vague.

- slow down and take a breath
- jumped around a lot tell me during speech what point you are addressing
- make eye contact w/ judge and opp

both

- address point by point ~~and~~ instead of saying that all points fall due to X

Room: Nobli A
 Flight A: Start 5:00
 Open Lincoln Douglas

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Palo Alto Fee	Max = 30	Westmont Keates	Max = 30
Shannon Fee	<u>26</u>	Paula Keates	<u>25</u>

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] (Piyush Shah)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

V.S. non-citizen treaty du-process.

shaman.

Value: Morality

RT/wran Behav.

1) Univ. hu. rts

1. Thomas P.

2. James.

3. Terrorism

prosecutor

Death Pen.

Int'l support

extremist

2) Depr. of Rts.

3) Human Rts.

Yes

Cross Ex.

Children

Abuse

NO

Defy.

Art. 1

Perh.

U.S. citizen

W: Morality

Goal: Fulfill m.

Utilitarian.

Judges.

criminals

At Aida. 700

witnesses/revenge.

2) Religion

non-citizen not needed in court.

3) Innocence Arg.

Arg: upholding Rts.

self purg.

lies.

stats.

Methodology.

Detainees

Rts.

Lives vs. Rts

Saul Rts

Age

mental

carriers

Right

related

to

crim.

	S	P
Anal.
Refutation
Cross exam.
evid.
Org.
delivery
Total.	<u>26</u>	<u>25</u>

Room: Arts 135
Flight A: Start 5:00
Open Lincoln Douglas

2

Pachauri, Shalin

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

Wei Wang
St. Francis

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

James Logan Rahimi

Max = 30

MSJ Kalakuntla

Max = 30

Rod Rahimi

28

Tej Kalakuntla

27

The better debating was done by the AFF from Rod Rahimi
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: strong arguments + steady mind.
- logical: make best use of cross Q to expose contradiction.

Room: O Connor 104
Flight A: Start 5:00
Open Lincoln Douglas

2

12, Evergreen

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
MSJ Zhang	Max = 30	San Ramon Gupta	Max = 30
George Zhang	_____	Rohith Gupta	_____

The better debating was done by the Aff from Zhang
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:

No show for Rohith Gupta

Room: Daly 206
Flight A: Start 5:00
Open Lincoln Douglas

2

10, Evergreen
La /

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
La Reina Sullivan	Max = 30	Palo Alto Haris	Max = 30
Kathleen Sullivan	<u>28</u>	Anish Haris	<u>29</u>

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: Orin

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: could not respond to neg:'s cross ex question
Constitutional due process.

Aff: says neg dropped his contention 1. But neg: did not
drop his contention 1.

Aff: lost in her last speech.

Room: Nobli B
Flight A: Start 5:00
Open Lincoln Douglas

2

DeBettencourt, M

Purnis, F (Present to train)

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

MSJ Wadhera

Max = 30

Mountain View Thvar

Max = 30

Karuna Wadhera

28.5

Keshav Thvar

27

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

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

Signed: Emily M. Purf

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- very persuasive!
- good use of evidence; examples

Neg

- use warrants!
- connect your arguments/ contentions to the framework (value/criterion)
- be able to explain your own evidence!
- great overview/crystallization

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

MSJ Chopra

Max = 30

Aditya Chopra

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bishop O Dowd Clark

Max = 30

Graham Clark

26

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

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

Signed: E. Helle

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff first Constructive was a sound argument. I enjoyed the logical reasoning displayed in your ordering of contentions & subpoints. A very tautly orchestrated case.

Neg Constructive - one contention was risky. One example of a list ~~is~~ isn't a trend - it could very likely be an exception - an aberration. Also, you didn't successfully link it to "creating a dangerous world" because it was all hypothetical.

Aff won with ~~cross-examination~~. Cross examination.

Neg, in Rebuttal, played a timely card regarding a number of conventional trials having no effect on terrorist acts. The question, though, is it enough to win?

~~Neg dropped~~ "Life outweighs morality" - this statement is where Neg loses. Aff's argument was strong and I agree with the final rebuttal - Aff ~~also~~ linked soft power to the Res. when he compared it to hard power - which he stated in first speech was the status quo.

Room: Arts 133
Flight A: Start 5:00
Open Lincoln Douglas

Jim Zhang 2
Palo Alto High School

~~Reykalin, Kyle~~

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Bonita Vista Gonzalez

Max = 30

Sabrina Gonzalez

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Lynbrook Wang

Max = 30

Christine Wang

26

The better debating was done by the AFF from Sabrina Gonzalez
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 had clear points and presented them in logical orders, NEG was strong and aggressive to debate her points, but the evidences may be questionable.

AFF can be better on presentation skill, more confidence. Overall both AFF and NEG did good job on debating, the AFF is slightly better on rationalization of her points.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

low point win

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Douglas Frost

Max = 30

MSJ Sreekumar

Max = 30

Andy Frost

27

Sanjay Sreekumar

29

Douglas HS, NV

Mission ST high

The better debating was done by the AFF from Douglas HS, NV
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: *Tyler [Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Boils down to how I weigh debate

*extending rights wins over more lives saved on Justice
mortality*

*G. Bay cases are not used but 500/7 example wins over 9/11 non warrant since
Neg didn't e contradicted on ~~total~~ efficient military tribunals. Stated
that many more were ~~or~~ given off record, can't use since no evidence.*

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

MSJH - 04

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto Zheng

Max = 30

Leland Liu

Max = 30

Austin Zheng

27

Stacy Liu

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from Stacy
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:

Both Austin and Stacy did a great job debating. Stacy was very strong during cross-examinations and Austin at situations did not have a supporting arguments.
but Austin and Stacy has same value / value criterion but to Stacy's case around cost involved with the trials in aviation courts and a jury can make mistakes while trying major terrorists like Osama bin Laden, Austin didn't have much arguments to contradict.

Room: Arts 129
Flight A: Start 5:00
Open Lincoln Douglas

2

MSJ-LD-07, MSJ-L

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Bishop O Dowd Hawkins	Max = 30	James Logan Meller	Max = 30
Anna Hawkins	<u>28.5</u>	Mikhail Meller	<u>28.9</u>

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

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

Signed: Ryan H

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: Had good arguments & defended her arguments well
should improve a little on cross ex. Questioned opponent's
arg about his contentions well.

NEG: Had ~~very~~ good arguments & defended his arguments
well, questioned opponent's argument well.

Final decision is based on speaking ~~part~~ and presentation
and hence chose NEG wins this round.

Room: O'Connor 1
Flight A: Start 5:00
Open Lincoln Doug

2

Iyer, Natasha

Gay Gubler

SCUMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flight these start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

Saratoga Krishna

Rohith Krishna

POINTS

Max = 30

27.8

NEGATIVE

Palo Alto Braun

Noa Braun

POINTS

Max = 30

28.0

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

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

Signed: Gay Gubler

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION

RFD / Both strong, but negative was more well supported.

A - Affirmative CROSS EXAM - good
Rebuttal
Lost aff. - *ERADIA 2005 - strong arguments and well supported*

N - Negative CROSS EXAM
Rebuttal - *Jury of peers support for tribunal*
Rebuttal - *ICCPR - Tennessee and strong arguments*

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

MSJ Fong

Max = 30

Milpitas Ngo

Max = 30

Nathan Fong

28

Jonathan Ngo

29

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

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

Signed: Shaila Varadco (Krishna)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both sides were excellent. This was a close debate. Aff's main argument was that not granting due process implies that cruel and unusual punishment was acceptable and hence torture ~~was~~ continues. This was countered very effectively by the neg by saying that this was not topical and he was only saying that the US government ought not to extend to non-citizens accused of terrorism the same constitutional due process. This was very convincing and is the reason for my vote.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL


11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Harker Shah	Max=30	MSJ Tummala	Max=30
Manan Shah	<u>29</u>	Vineet Tummala	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the Aff from Harker Shah
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:
- AC is solid but I think you need to spend ^{more} time on the Inherent Right argument b/c as a deontological argument it could trump basically all neg arguments
- In IAR you need to really work on time allocation; you barely (not really) cover your CAD which is probably your strongest argument b/c it links really really well into neg framework. You should extend this early as a neg case turn
- work on enunciation, especially while reading text

Negs
- your NC does not negate. Your case draws No distinction between citizens & no citizens, it only argues that citizens should have DPP but all of these arguments apply equally to citizens & no citizens
- Don't say things like "I didn't hear my opponent, he talked too fast." I don't care. I heard him and that's all that matters.

Aff has better impacts to neg standard which basically becomes the default standard for the round
- Slippery slope (which neg concedes to by saying "we can suspend the courts")
↳ by removing us excc, has too much power + citizens lose rights
↳ empirical example of Farikh proves the
~~Aff~~ Neg impacts are speculative at best and rely on poorly defined links.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Leland Loftis

Max = 30

Cameron Loftis

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bonita Vista Mariscal

Max = 30

Alexander Mariscal

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: Dewan Zeng

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both did a good job!

Mr. Loftis provided a stronger case by bringing up facts & numbers.

Mr. Mariscal held his ground but is a little weak during cross-examination.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
St. Francis Singh	Max = 30	Saratoga Hsiao	Max = 30
Akriti Singh	<u>30</u>	Derek Hsiao	<u>30</u>

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

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

Signed: Jed Byrd

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This was a very even debate by two very skilled debaters. A more knowledgeable judge may have been able to distinguish some key strengths of 1 case over the other, but I could not. In the end, I give the win to Aff mostly on a general basis of being more persuaded. I tried to thoroughly track this debate and believe I understand which points were dropped, which points were agreed upon, and what each side claimed are the voting issues. All of that was very even. Both debaters were excellent at presenting their case attacking the other, even on some of the more subtle points that I haven't heard in other debates.

Great debate!

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Evergreen Naik	Max=30	MSJ Mittal	Max=30
Akshay Naik	<u>28</u>	Mudit Mittal	<u>28.5</u>

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

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

Signed: Mark Litton

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

General notes for judge only

1st Affirm: morality Moral truths - Moral to same lines. Excluding due process...
 1. ~~Pa~~ 2. Break in under goal of terrorism. 3.
 v. Permissibility maybe Aff - laid down for objectives, each one solid.
 Speech is rushing though which can detract from overall point.
 Cross: Cross primarily effective; neg held ground well - although some arguments were generally stated - it was difficult to support; when Aff asked when does ~~let~~ power of gov't - constitution.
 v. ~~well~~ Contracts v. morals. // Terrorist acts apply in unbanked way // impact - international terrorism - will expand/destroy world... // response is only - we get info from it. Cross: Effective // looking for refutation of when gov't get their authority; looking for refutation that terrorism is effective.
 Contracts v. moral; effectiveness of terrorism; effectiveness of tribunals vs. military courts.
 "Authority of gov't derives from morality..." - Aff.

COMMENTS: Both Aff & Neg ~~was~~ debated well ~~with~~ with clear arguments on both sides. While Neg made excellent points, he was also rushing his speech to get his points in, which may prevent these points from being absorbed. Contentions on both sides were interesting & well made; I felt the Aff made stronger arguments with his contract v. morality approach. While Neg refuted several of his points well, when asked where does gov't derive its authority he replied morality with no support of this - in future, he might refer to the constitution if this point is raised again. A good job for both.

Room: O Connor 107
Flight A: Start 5:00
Open Lincoln Douglas

2

Glenn, Kelsey

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
MSJ Prasad	Max = 30	Palo Alto Lau	Max = 30
Abhinav Prasad	<u>28.5</u>	Andrew Lau	<u>28</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF 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:

NEG concedes only usable evidence I can use to resolve Hard vs. Soft power debate.

Room: O Connor 106
Flight A: Start 5:00
Open Lincoln Douglas

2

MSJ-LD-05, MSJ-L

KIRAN DESAI, MSJH
MSJH - Fremont

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Palo Alto Takeuchi	Max = 30	Saratoga Munukutla	Max = 30
Rick Takeuchi	<u>26</u>	Venkat Munukutla	<u>28</u>

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: No

Signed: Kiran M Desai

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg. has argued very systematically point by point against Aff. in a very logical manner. Neg was very persuasive.

Aff. looked confused at times against his own arguments. Initially he agreed with Neg that killing Bin La Din was good truly then he said not it is not.