

Open  
Parli  
Elimy

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

Finals

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Arts 135

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

Leland Saratoga  
WTFB 5 pwrone wdrwrd miking

**AFFIRMATIVE** ~~Leland~~ Leland


POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
1	Speaker: <del>Justin Chiang</del> Haba Shi		
2	Speaker: <del>Shawna Agrawal</del> Ondivero		

**NEGATIVE** Saratoga

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
1	Speaker: <del>Haba Shi</del> Justin Chiang		
2	Speaker: <del>Ondivero</del> Shawna Agrawal		

The better debating was done by the Neg from Saratoga  
AFF OF NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

So... Adv. I has two impacts: here + climate change.  
here is ignored / not weighted, and h-q on climate change is  
dropped.

Adv II, dropping / not weighted, 1 compare v. ppl + sol/gndw causes  
it fatal

Adv III, can't solve, not weighted enough

Since your team on DA is defeated, you must lose. Sorry.

I do not evaluate h-q role as it is unnecessary.

Flight A: Start ASAP  
Open Parliamentary

W ELIM

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

Finals

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Arts 135

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

Leland Saratoga

## AFFIRMATIVE

POS	School	POINTS: _____	RANKS
	Leland		
	Speaker: _____		
	Speaker: _____		

## NEGATIVE

POS	School	POINTS: _____	RANKS
	Saratoga		
	Speaker: _____		
	Speaker: _____		

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:

*CORAL*

W ELIM

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

Finals

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Arts 135

Weland Saratoga

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

## AFFIRMATIVE

POS	School: <u>Weland</u>	POINTS: _____	RANKS
	Speaker: _____		
	Speaker: _____		

## NEGATIVE

POS	School: <u>Saratoga</u>	POINTS: _____	RANKS
	Speaker: _____		
	Speaker: _____		

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

ORAL

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

Semi

Leland v. Foxford

Arts 134

Finals

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

**AFFIRMATIVE** *Leland*

POS	School: <i>Leland</i>	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: <i>Han</i>	<del>26</del>	<del>1</del>
	Speaker: <i>Chiu</i>	<del>28</del>	<del>1</del>

**NEGATIVE** *Foxford*

POS	School: <i>Foxford</i>	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: <i>Him</i>	<del>28</del>	<del>2</del>
	Speaker: <i>Jain</i>	<del>27</del>	<del>3</del>

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:

USFG should *Den fracking*

PM: You need ~~more~~ way more structure. (uniqueness, link, sublink)  
 Your impacts are not linked out enough. And  
 Ozka Aquiter refers to hegstone XL ... not fracking.  
 I'll only hold that against you if neg brings it up.  
 Also, heg wars was not linked out enough.

LO: You should have ran T on their definition on only natural  
 gas. B/C technically your DA1) <sup>is</sup> doesn't link. *→ coren shift.*  
 Need to quantify your impacts better. "losing jobs" is vague.  
 Explain to me why brackish water prevents.

MB: Good job pointing out their De-link + cross applying 2nd AD  
 MO: You need to signpost. I have no clue where  
 you are. I have to do too much work  
 figuring out where you are.

All of you need to quantify. I have no idea how many jobs <sup>are being</sup> lost.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

Semi  
Finals

Arts  
134

Leland v. Foxford  
11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

**AFFIRMATIVE** Leland

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: Jason Han	26	4
	Speaker: Vincent Chiu	25	3

**NEGATIVE** Foxford

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: Jaewan Kim	28	1
	Speaker: Satecham Jain	27	2

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

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

Signed: Vincent

**COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:**

- The neg stated that the only fracking station would be in Alaska w/ low environmental impacts.
- Neg won agriculture → we do have an increased supply of fuel (no humans extinction)
- no guarantee of green energy by eliminating fracking
- CP saves some jobs
- AFF didn't link too well to their impacts by the end

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

Semi

Leland v. Foxford

Arts 134

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Finals

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

**AFFIRMATIVE** Leland

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: _____		
	Speaker: _____		

**NEGATIVE** Oxford

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: _____		
	Speaker: _____		

The better debating was done by the AFF from \_\_\_\_\_  
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: should ban fracking

there needs to be some fact checking about natural gas and fracking all over this debate. most of our oil comes from Canada. Natural gas isn't really used in cars at all (liquefaction tech is still in R+D). Neg double covers themselves & divide the ground. The leaks into the water that they're willing to concede & magnifies the aff's environmental harm advantage. I vote on the aff solving environmental harm and agriculture.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

Semi  
Finals

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

A78 135

Granite Bay v. Saratoga

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

## AFFIRMATIVE

POS	School: <u>Granite Bay</u>	POINTS: _____	RANKS
1	Speaker: <u>Habashi</u>		3
2	Speaker: <u>Ontiveros</u>		2

## NEGATIVE

POS	School: <u>Saratoga</u>	POINTS: _____	RANKS
1	Speaker: <u>Justin Ching</u>		1
2	Speaker: <u>Sharway Agrawal</u>		4

Agrawal

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

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD in Round

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

Semi  
Finals

Arts 135

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Granite Bay vs. Saratoga Ac

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

HO

## AFFIRMATIVE

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Granite Bay		
	Speaker: Habashi	28	1
	Speaker: Ontiveros	26	3

## NEGATIVE

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: Chiang	27.5	2
	Speaker: Agrawal	25	4

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Oral

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

Semi  
Finals

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ARTS 135

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

Granite Bay v. Saratoga

## AFFIRMATIVE

POS	School: Granite Bay	POINTS:	RANKS
PM	Speaker: Habashi	26	3
MG	Speaker: Antiveros	27	4

## NEGATIVE

POS	School: Saratoga	POINTS:	RANKS
LO	Speaker: Justin Chiang	30	1
MO	Speaker: Shavanya Agrawal	26	2

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

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

Signed: Ryan Reed

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Res: USFC to pass a carbon tax

I vote Neg largely because I buy the "double bind" that's been brought up by the neg. Aff says there is ~~not~~ long term solvency but concedes / non-interacts arguments with regards to the short term. I also vote neg off of DA<sub>2</sub> that has too little ink on it and no refutation to the warrant

Room: Eng 108 *Orb 135*  
Flight A: Start ASAP  
Open Parliamentary

QUAR

~~12, Evergreen~~

*C. Schlotzbaum*

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

GraBay HO (Justin Habashi & Nicolas Ontiveros) vs. Leland DS (Sam Deghuee & Dominic Sonkowsky)

AFFIRMATIVE

*Leland DS*

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT


NEGATIVE

*Green ite Bay*

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

*Greece should leave the EU*

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

Signed:  *m.lptas*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

*no questions not cool  
Did they really do 6 months holiday?  
Re capitalization  
Bank Holiday for 6 months? R.U. serious?  
Shut down economy for 6 months with no  
salaries or trade? No currency exchange  
for tourists?*

*buying Holiday. Six  
cuts tourism and kills econ  
No crutch to lean on*

Arts 135

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

Leland DS (Sam Deghuae & Dominic Sonkowsky) vs. GraBay HO (Justin Habashi & Nicolas Ontiveros)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Leland DS

GraBay HO

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT


Greece should leave the European Union.

The better debating was done by the NEG from GRABAY.

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg team successfully challenged the claims and the points raised by Aff gov team. They were very persuasive on their stance on how the gov policy would cause more harm than states gov. Speakers on Neg team ~~were~~ did a great job of presenting their case and were open to challenging the ~~of~~ gov team during their speeches.

Overall more convincing done by neg team.

Room: Eng 108  
Flight A: Start ASAP  
Open Parliamentary

10/15/135

QUAR

Alamzai, Mujda

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

Greece should leave the Euro Union

GraBay HO (Justin Habashi & Nicolas Ontiveros) vs. Leland DS (Sam Deghuae & Dominic Sonkowsky)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Leland DS

GraBay HO

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Spectacular round, honestly. Best round I've seen all tournament bar none.  
Narrow Aff win - Aff does a better job explaining that inflation is good and that lack of ~~control~~ <sup>control</sup> of monetary policy is problem b/c loose econ is deflated. They did a good job defending bank w/ argument.  
Ultimately their arguments are more speculative and have less concrete examples - not same as Germany also w/out b/c of the increase of sovereignty of the Euro.  
Good job all getting to Quarters.

Room:-Eng 326  
Flight A: Start ASAP  
Open Parliamentary

Arts 232

QUAR

16, Leland Judge

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Lynbrook SV (Sohil Sathe & Anirudh Velamuri) vs. Fox JaKi (Saksham Jain & Jaewon Kim)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Sohil Sathe & Anirudh Velamuri (Lynbrook)

Jaewon Kim & Saksham Jain (Fox)

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Christina Gray

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Sohil:  
good speaker. However, it is true that you should have read the resolution better.

Anirudh:  
good speaker as well. could have done better trying to refute the opponents contentions.

Jaewon:  
great speaker, especially during your rebuttal. Good job pointing out the resolution.

Saksham:  
excellent job sticking w/ your contentions and pointing out their flaws.

Reason: NEG stated that resolution calls for PLANS! therefore, winning this round. AFF's case was contradicting.

Room: Eng 326  
Flight A: Start ASAP  
Open Parliamentary

Arts 232

QUAR

Parker, Margot

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

Fox JaKi (Saksham Jain & Jaewon Kim) vs. Lynbrook SV (Sohil Sathe & Anirudh Velamuri)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Lynbrook Sohil & Anirudh  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

~~Lynbrook, Sohil & Anirudh~~  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Fox JaKi: Saksham & Jaewon

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

Signed: Mel Qhee Ireland H.S.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: Eng 326 — Arts 232  
Flight A: Start ASAP  
Open Parliamentary

QUAR

19, Leland Judge  
Peter Chiu

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

Fox JaKi (Saksham Jain & Jaewon Kim) vs. Lynbrook SV (Sohil Sathe & Anirudh Velamuri)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

Lynbrook SV


NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

**NEGATIVE**

Fox JaKi

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg Team made a good argument of resolution of Turkey's plans, but aff team didn't counter back until the last speech.

Neg Team points out Russia & China will veto it. Aff team didn't counter back well either.

Arts 129

SHEN, JIANFENG  
(EVHS)

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

China's new leaders should allow for municipal elections

BisOD AP (Nicholas Accinelli & Nadia Perl) vs. Saratoga AC (Shauray Agrawal & Justin Chiang)

### AFFIRMATIVE

### NEGATIVE

Saratoga (Shauray & Justin)  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

BisOD (Nicholas & Nadia)  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AFF from Saratoga (Shauray & Justin)  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: 

#### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff1: Reduce corruption; no elections, no accountability; Bo Xi lai;  
Encourage growth of middle class  
Reduce government inefficiency; 30 mil death from Great Leap Forward  
Promote political stability

Neg1: What major problems to solve  
meritocracy is a good system  
Bad democracy is worse than good meritocracy  
Economy doing well  
Unconstitutional? by 30, have to decide on private vs public sector

Aff2: Harms: corruption, protests  
Interest of leaders aligned with that of the people.  
Neg1 didn't respond to inefficiency

Neg2: Bad in status quo? economy and power  
You can't pass a law against the constitution  
accountability  
Political instability  
Meritocracy working

Neg1: Logical system  
Constitutionality  
more corruption with elections; no monitoring in elections  
opponents didn't prove policies of elected leaders would be better

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

BisOD AP (Nicholas Accinelli & Nadia Perl) vs. Saratoga AC (Shauray Agrawal & Justin Chiang)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Saratoga AC

BisOD AP

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

China's leaders ~~will~~ should allow municipal elections

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

Signed: Sundar Velamuri

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The AFF team won the debate with a very concise and knowledgeable set of plan & net benefits. The AFF team outlined the harms are inherent to the existing system and how inaction could result in severe detriments to the Chinese society. The NEA team spoke very well but was found lacking in substantive arguments. The NEA team focused more on procedural issues and made unsubstantiated assumptions. The AFF team was able to rebut the arguments and convince me that promoting caution before to deal with local issues was the way to go.

Arts 129

RAVI POLISETTY

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

BisOD AP (Nicholas Accinelli & Nadia Perl) vs. Saratoga AC (Shauray Agrawal & Justin Chiang)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Shauray & Justin

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Nicholas & Nadia

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

China's New leaders should allow for municipal elections

The better debating was done by the

NEG  
AFF or NEG

from

BisOD  
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- (1) Both parties have done extremely well in articulating the points
- (2) Nadia was a bit too fast in the way she spoke - and would encourage her to slow down.
- (3) While both parties provided good rebuttals, I pick BisOD because BisOD's point that Saratoga did not provide a "compelling" reason for the ban on the franchise to force a change in the states law is well argued and the angle most point to sway the decision.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

Everg TG (Sindhoora Tallapragada & Kshitij Gaur) vs. Leland CH (Vincent Chiu & Jason Han)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Leland

Evergreen

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

We disclosed

It ended up coming down to the impact of world econ collapse v. the potential for the raising of interest rates on loans. In this case it seems better to cut Greece out as a member of the E.U. and risk that v. the perceived certainty of the E.U. collapsing if it remains, as goes uncontested by ~~the~~ the Neg after the Aff makes it.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

Everg TG (Sindhora Tallapragada & Kshitij Gaur) vs. Leland CH (Vincent Chiu & Jason Han)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

~~Leland CH~~ Leland CH  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Everg TG  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Nick Brummet

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams did an excellent jobs;  
AFF wins mainly due to my pick-ups and responses  
; either austerities or default - we need  
x-applies dont work in this case for Adv's.

RFD; conceded bc and harms requires  
action.

Room: ~~Sul-Eng-602~~ Arts ~~232~~ 134  
Flight A: Start ASAP  
Open Parliamentary

QUAR

~~Batra, Pragya~~  
Aulal, Greg

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

<sup>4<sup>st</sup></sup> Leland CH (Vincent Chiu & Jason Han) vs. Everg TG (<sup>4<sup>st</sup></sup> Sindhoora Tallapragada & Kshitij Gaur)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

Leland

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

**NEGATIVE**

Evergreen

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

MountView LA (Leland Lee & Tom Ashkenazi) vs. Lynbrook SV (Sohil Sathe & Anirudh Velamuri)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

MountView LA (Leland Lee/Tom Ashkenazi) Lynbrook SV (Sathe/Velamuri)  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Nancy Andrade

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I think the Neg is ahead on framing the debate and why they win under this certain frame work.  
Also, the Aff plays more defensive in the final speech/ doesn't give me a reason to vote for them AND not vote for Neg, whereas the Neg gives me voters and tells me why not to vote aff.

Good Job!

Room: Oconnor 209  
Flight A: Start ASAP  
Open Parliamentary

OCTA

Stoddard-Phillips, Susan  
~~Eastside, Jim~~  
Summit Prep

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

*Neg* *Aff*  
Lynbrook SV (Sohil Sathe & Anrudh Velamuri) vs. MountView LA (Leland Lee & Tom Ashkenazi)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Mountain View LA  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Lynbrook SV  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: *Sm Stoddard-Phillips*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

Lynbrook SV (Sohil Sathe & Anirudh Velamuri) vs. MountView LA (Leland Lee & Tom Ashkenazi)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

MountView LA

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT


**NEGATIVE**

Lynbrook SV

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Frame was policy, gives aff fiat, becomes question of impacts
- racism outweighs risk of some voter fraud
- very good chance that it increases legitimate turnout → "ID increases turnout" did not have causal component
- negs arg was based on a mischaracterization of affirmative's excluded population - answered repeatedly in aff speeches & point of info, neg did not address
- neg's double turn arg on ID law states fraud was potentially effective but not impacted

Room: Benson 15  
Flight: Start ASAP  
Open Parliamentary

EM 108  
B

OCTA

13, Leland Judge

Delinda Dane WHS

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

BisO'D VY (Cate Vegis & Daylen Yang) vs. Everg TG (Sindhoora Tallapragada & Kshitij Gaur)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

~~Evergreen~~ Evergreen  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

~~Bishop~~ Bishop  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Delinda Dane

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

USFG should replace the Interstate Highway system.

- Kshitij  
AFF
- 1) solves for climate chg
  - 2) stimulate economy
  - 3) health (mental)
  - 4) faster efficient
- Net benefits ↑

gov spend 50 bil on pod cars  
cars spew carbon  
wind energy / bio fuels  
personalized pod car  
methane gas trapped in tundra  
implementing pod system would create jobs which will help the economy -  
reducing unemployment will help mental health of unemployed individuals  
faster travel is good / saves time

Cate

Number of pod cars?  
disadvantage - cost over fiscal cliff

Time frame / ASAP?  
Because of deficit - not possible  
Pod cars not clearly defined  
electricity - takes a lot of water  
Constitutional right to own car?  
emissions to build? Effect on enviro  
green jobs bill instead!

Room: Benson 15  
 Flight B: Start ASAP  
 Open Parliamentary

Eng 10 B  
 B

OCTA

Subramanian, Ja  
 Bhatia, Kamal

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

BisO'D VY (Cate Vegis & Daylen Yang) vs. Everg TG (Sindhoora Tallapragada & Kshitij Gaur)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Sindhoora & Kshitij  
 NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Cate & Daylen  
 NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Aff from Sindhoora & Kshitij.

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff		Neg	
Sindhoora	Kshitij	Cate	Daylen
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Carbon Emission</li> <li>- DOT.</li> <li>- Methane</li> <li>- Eco stimulate.</li> <li>- Jobs.</li> <li>- Engineers</li> <li>- More \$, More spending</li> <li>- State of Mind:</li> <li>- Psychological D/O</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Negotiated the deal successfully</li> <li>- Air clean hard; H<sub>2</sub>O clean somewhat easy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Eliminate all cars to decrease CO<sub>2</sub>.</li> <li>- fiscal cliff</li> <li>- \$50B</li> <li>- No ben?</li> <li>- x x x.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ben:</li> <li>- Cost:</li> <li>- No funding</li> <li>- \$50B, 50k unites</li> <li>- \$500B</li> <li>- \$2T.</li> </ul>

Room: Benson 15  
Flight B: Start ASAP  
Open Parliamentary

Eng 108  
B

OCTA

Park, Sarah

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

BisO'D VY (Cate Vegis & Daylen Yang) vs. Evergreen TG (Sindhooora Tallapragada & Kshitij Gaur)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Kshitij Gaur & Sindhooora T. (EVHS)  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Cate Vegis & Daylen Yang (BISO'D)  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Kshitij: Good speaker  
but not on your flow.

Sindhooora: speech delivery  
could use some improvement.  
example helped your contentions.

Cate: excellent speaker.  
Good job refuting.

Daylen: Great speaker  
as well. Good job  
emphasizing about the  
monetary issues.

Reason for decision: AFF was able to define  
"replace" as well as show the  
net-benefit. Next time be more  
clear on your plan.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

Leland CH (Vincent Chiu & Jason Han) vs. BisO'D RC (Tim Ring & Jordan Crosby)

### AFFIRMATIVE

### NEGATIVE

Vincent Chiu & Jason Han  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Tim Ring & Jordan Crosby  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Neg. from Tim Ring & Jordan Crosby  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: K.N.A.

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Abb

Jason.  
- facts, figures  
- Presentation and pronunciation - ambiguous  
- 4th Amendment  
- Third article

Vincent:  
- 4th Amendment  
- FIFA (OOUSA)

Neg

Tim  
- FIFA.  
- good challenge to Aff Contestants  
- Wire tapping illegal.  
- Answered questions with supporting facts

Jordan

- Good supporting facts for negation.

~~3~~ A

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

Bis'O'D RC (Tim Ring & Jordan Crosby) vs. Leland CH (Vincent Chiu & Jason Han)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

~~Leland~~ ~~Chiu~~ ~~Crosby~~ ~~Ring~~

~~Bishop~~ ~~Chiu~~ ~~Han~~

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Delinda Dane

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Jordan Scotus should rule against mass acquisition of electronic surveillance in the case of Clopper vs Amnesty International <sup>US</sup>

Jason AFF  
Value  
1) 4th amendment - unreasonable search & seizure  
wiretapping # email same  
2) 3rd article separation of powers state & federal taking away states rights  
3) Anti american sentiment increase terrorism

Clause "probable cause" 168 hours w/o warrant  
1) FIFA (outside US interacting w/ Foreign  
2) States interacting w/ foreign countries  
3) Terrorism not increased unconstitutional

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

BisO'D RC (Tim Ring & Jordan Crosby) vs. Leland CH (Vincent Chiu & Jason Han)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Jason Han & Vincent Chiu (Leland)

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Jordan Crosby & Tim Ring (BisOP)

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Bishop

Tim: you are a great speaker, your refutation against anti-american sentiment was weak, could work more on your contentions.

Jordan: Excellent speaker. your Osama example however is irrelevant since you agreed that this is only for US citizens.

Leland (Gov)

Jason: Good speaker but you still need to work on your flaw. your 2nd contention is easily refutable & can easily lose. Need to emphasize more on that contention. Excellent job during your rebuttal.

Vincent:

Good job refuting your opp contentions. could work on some areas of your refutations but overall great job.

Reason for decision: AFF was very clear on their case. This case is based on UNITED STATES citizens. NEG gave evidence/example about someone that is not a US citizen - irrelevant. However, NEG was the better speaking group. would have loved to see stronger refutations from the AFF. close round though. Great job to both teams.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

Everg GZ (Brighu Gollabinnie & Kenny Zhang) vs. GraBay HO (Justin Habashi & Nicolas Ontiveros)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Everg GZ

GraBay HO

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

SCOTUS should rule Affirmative action Unconstitutional

The better debating was done by the AFF from EVERG GZ

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Sunder Velamuri

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The AFF team won the debate in a very, very close finish. The AFF was able to defend its propositions of Constitutionality and holistic nature though they lost out on the Commerce clause. The NEG team did a terrific job though they failed on the crucial task of moving legal precedence on the Constitutionality of affirmative action aka the action by CA legislators.

Room: Eng 305  
Flight A: Start ASAP  
Open Parliamentary

Parlor B  
B

OCTA

~~6, Evergreen~~

VELAMURI, SUNDER-

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

Leland DS (Sam Deghuae & Dominic Sonkowsky) vs. NotDam AL (Nhada Ahmed & Kitty Lan)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Leland DS

NotDam AL

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Sunder Velamuri

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The AFF team did a good job of layouting out a ~~good~~ well identified plan as well as the net benefits emanating from the plan. AFF team identified the dire consequences of not making the investment. The first speaker of the NEG team did a poor job negating any parts of the plan. Misidentifying the start of the plan (2013 and not 2012), not negating the need for the investment (Security of the US through intelligence gathering space technology) etc. The second NEG speaker did an effective job though ~~he~~ could not refute the need for investment as well as consequences of not investing in NASA.

Room: Eng 305  
Flight A: Start ASAP  
Open Parliamentary

Roller B

OCTA

Parker, Margot

USFG should significantly increase its investment in NASA

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

Leland DS (Sam Deghuae & Dominic Sonkowsky) vs. NotDam AL (Nhada Ahmed & Kitty Lan)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Leland DS

Not Dam AL

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Neg from Not Dam AL  
AFF OR NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Mark

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Harm - Neg, Neg proved U.S. is still far ahead in spending and advancements for the national space program. It's unnecessary and money could remain in Public's hands or used for better programs.

Funding - Aff, CBO shows more than enough more will be generated by ~~cutting~~ expiring top <sup>Bracket</sup> Bush tax cuts.

Advantages - Neg, Privatization has proven more efficient <sup>of Russia & China</sup> capable. NASA still has enough funding for exclusive Gov projects.

Adv - Aff, NASA <sup>spending</sup> does stimulate jobs & economic activity.

DA1 - <sup>Neg</sup> highest budget ever was 196 & NASA still wastes billions on projects.

DA2 - <sup>Neg</sup> Neg showed areas where privatization is undesirable (intelligence) more careful & efficient.

can still be covered by current NASA budget while others can be given to the private sector, which raises efficiency through competition.

Criterion: I voted <sup>Neg</sup> primarily on the Harm/significance argument that it's an unnecessary plan and the Advantages don't warrant this amount of Gov spending.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

NotDam AL (Nhada Ahmed & Kitty Lan) vs. Leland DS (Sam Deghuae & Dominic Sonkowsky)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Dehuae/Sonkowsky (Leland)  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Ahmed/Lan (Not Dam)  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature] Kyle Nollett

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Good round by both Teams. Overall the arguments on the Affirmative side were persuasive

In terms of stated harms, the negative team did not effectively show how Intelligence collection could be prevented, & never contested the harm.

The neg team did observe that the level of funding of space in China was 1/2 USA funding but was shown to be incorrect in asserting that there was no Russian space program. In combination the Affirmative was persuasive that this is a geo political threat.

Regarding Technology advances the affirmative showed a credible historical pattern of advances and disburse a solar array project that lost funding. The negative did not have any real data or strong arguments that these advances would not continue on that private industry would take on the riskier projects. The SpaceX was noted as an example but their one customer is NASA, so not a good example of private industry developing a market.

Finally the market multiplier data so-called compounding, relative to the more general assertions on the neg side that something else could be done with the money. Overall the Aff showed net benefits in security, technology & Economy.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

GraBay HO (Justin Habashi & Nicolas Ontiveros) vs. Everg GZ (Brighu Gollabinnie & Kenny Zhang)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Gollabinnie / Zhang  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Habashi / Ontiveros  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature] 12/14 A. Witt

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Good debate by very skilled teams, ultimately the arguments from the negatives were more compelling

Regarding constitutionality it was not clear that affirmative action denied anyone an overall right to education as the person so to another school. Also, it seemed clear that race was only one of many factors considered in admissions.

Regarding benefits, the Affirmative team never denied the LA study that diversity is good.

The observation by the neg team regarding the 2003 case allowing state oversight and documenting a case in which whose society did in fact change the policies was a key point in concluding that ~~rather~~ a federal ruling against affirmative action is overruled.

People lying about race and the impossibility of determining race were interesting, but ultimately did not come across as compelling points for the aff.

Room: Parlor B  
Flight A: Start ASAP  
Open Parliamentary

scds should rule Affirmative action unconstitutional

OCTA

Zepeda, Frank

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

Everg GZ (Brighu Gollabinnie & Kenny Zhang) vs. GraBay HO (Justin Habashi & Nicolas Ontiveros)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Gra Bay HO

Everg GZ

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Mark

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~the~~ <sup>criteria</sup> Because the value was agreed to as constitutionality, I didn't pay much heed to both teams arguments about the merits of Affirmative Action. The argument on Commerce clause went Neg because it's intention was not toward anything related to Aff action. I went Aff because Aff showed discrimination based on race is illegal and reverse discrimination includes using racial ~~aff action~~ <sup>aff action</sup> to increase diversity, which violates the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

BisOD AP (Nicholas Accinelli & Nadia Perl) vs. Prospect SL (Krishnan Srinivasan & Aaron Latta)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Prospect SL

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

BisOD AP

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Nancy Prohaska

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I think the neg establishes early and throughout the debate a huge  $\text{\$}$  deficit towards the AFF's plan. Neg is really precise on cutting any risk of the aff solving and really provides <sup>Adv/ explanations</sup> to their ~~decision~~ case while weighing against theoretically granted benefits of the Aff's case.

I think the AFF could've done a little better on articulating how specific groups the Neg lists (women, minority groups, young adults, elderly) can still access HC ~~care~~ w/o Obama care.

Also, I don't buy the argument that the NEG assumes HC won't exist w/o Obama care. I think they grant that and allow for these even if statements.

I think <sup>MPX!</sup> benefits of ~~the~~ Neg outweigh the Aff after Neg takes out the solvency.

2009

B

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

Prospect SL (Krishnan Srinivasan & Aaron Latta) vs. BisOD AP (Nicholas Accinelli & Nadia Perl)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Prospect SL

BisOD AP

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Came down to economics of downsizing vs economics of healthcare and cost in terms of life
- healthcare cost vs downsizing was a wash bc lack of statistics,
- ~~neg~~ conceded loss of life outweighs, aff defense ~~was~~ "no one will use coverage w/out ACA" was answered by <sup>extended</sup> neg continuing ~~cost~~ ~~costs~~.
- "Stimulus" vs "\$1 tril" could have been leveraged by either side to win the economics debate but didn't get fleshed out
- neg won voter framing
- aff was winning uniqueness of the lag of FS, but not the terminal impacts clearly

Room: Oconnor 215  
Flight A Start ASAP  
Open Parliamentary

204  
B OCTA

Stoddard-Phillips, Susan  
~~5, Evergreen~~  
Summit Prep

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

*Neq* *aff*  
BisOD AP (Nicholas Accinelli & Nadia Peri) vs. Prospect SL (Krishnan Srinivasan & Aaron Latta)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Prospect SL  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Bis OD AP  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: *Sm Stoddard-Phillips*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Close call on this well argued debate, Breadth of argument, state a impact (including effective wrap up by demographics) tipped win for Neq, also Neq did good job refuting (by clarifying) Papa John example brought up by aff.

Room: ~~Lucas 310~~  
Flight: ~~Start ASAP~~  
Open Parliamentary

ENG 326  
Flight B

OCTA

~~8, Evergreen~~

Savage

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

Leland NW (Bang Nguyen & Young Wu) vs. Fox JaKi (Saksham Jain & Jaewon Kim)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**


Leland

Fox JaKi

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- 1) Salvevery ussre - how does 25% help a bad agency
- 2) Priv sector has 2x Cap that NASA does = Cheaper, better alternative in CBA
- 3) Fund proj's directly rather than thru ~~agg~~ NASA
- 4) Envi harms unemssered by aff.
- 5) Cant fund the plan w/o cutting edic/health/welfare
- 6) Priv sector now has 3 US co's in space exploration that are now of tech that are non-space-related.

Room: ~~Lucas 310~~  
Flight ~~A~~: Start ASAP  
Open Parliamentary

Eng 326  
Flight B

OCTA

~~Akella, Mr.~~

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

Leland NW (Bang Nguyen & Young Wu) vs. Fox JaKi (Saksham Jain & Jaewon Kim)

AFFIRMATIVE

Leland NW

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Fox JaKi

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: ~~Lucas 310~~ ENG 326  
Flight A: Start ASAP  
Open Parliamentary Flight B

OCTA

~~1, Evergreen~~

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

Leland NW (Bang Nguyen & Young Wu) vs. Fox JaKi (Saksham Jain & Jaewon Kim)

**AFFIRMATIVE** (Leland NW)  
1A: Bang Nguyen  
1B: Young Wu  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

**NEGATIVE** (Fox JaKi)  
2A: Jaewon Kim  
2B: Saksham Jain  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Neg from Fox JaKi (Jaewon Kim Saksham Jain)  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Carman South

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: USFA should significantly increase investment in NASA

Bang Nguyen  
- Good speaker  
- Came up with 25% increase but did not see a basis.  
- Did not clearly refute the point about investing directly in private companies vs. NASA  
~~Young Wu~~  
Young Wu  
- Great speaker.  
- Suggested that bureaucracy is not as bad as it seems but basis not defended.

Jaewon Kim  
- Great speaker  
- Good job in refuting Aff's arguments  
- Do not quite agree with your environmental argument  
Saksham Jain  
- Great speaker  
- Did a good job of validating your argument  
- Handled POI well

Overall, I believe that the Neg team won. The solvency argument was not satisfactorily answered by the Aff. In addition the Neg team's idea of funding private companies was not opposed by the Aff.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

BisO'D WZ (Caitlin Walsh & Marco Zepeda) vs. Saratoga AC (Shauray Agrawal & Justin Chiang)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

*Saratoga*

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

**NEGATIVE**

*BisO'D WZ*

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the *NEG* from *BisO'D WZ*  
AFF. or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: *AK*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

BisO'D WZ (Caitlin Walsh & Marco Zepeda) vs. Saratoga AC (Shauray Agrawal & Justin Chiang)

1A **AFFIRMATIVE (SARATOGA AC)**  
Justin Chiang  
1B Shauray Agrawal  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

**NEGATIVE** Bis O'D WZ  
2A Marco Zepeda  
2B Caitlin Walsh  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Aff from Saratoga AC (Justin Chiang, Shauray Agrawal)  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Nauman Powell

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: SCOTUS should rule VOTER ID laws unconstitutional

- Justin Chiang
- Great speaker
  - ~~very~~ cogent arguments
  - Good closing
  - Should have taken at least on question during debate
- Shauray Agrawal
- Good speaker
  - Provided good arguments in contradicting oppony team
  - should have been more courteous to opponent but I'm not deducting points

- Marco Zepeda
- Great Speaker
  - good refutation
  - provided context of refutation
  - Did not need burden entirely.
- Caitlin Walsh
- Great Speaker
  - Agreed with you that the Neg team does not need to provide <sup>offensive</sup> arguments
  - Did provide good points in favour of your side

Overall, by a slim margin, I ~~believe~~ find in favor of the Affirmative team, primarily because ~~only~~ the US Supreme Court needs to find only one aspect to be unconstitutional ~~rather~~ even ~~not~~ when undergoing the strict scrutiny test.

Savage

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please disclose and ONLY give oral comments AFTER you return your ballot

Saratoga AC (Shauray Agrawal & Justin Chiang) vs. BisO'D WZ (Caitlin Walsh & Marco Zepeda)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Saratoga AC  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

BisO'D WZ  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg - 1) Do not disappear at end of prep. You were gone for at least 2 minutes  
2) You were not in protected time when Aff wanted to pose a question - you were at 1:08  
3) You went 17 seconds over time in 2<sup>nd</sup> Constructive  
4) Both of you should work on word economy because you spoke rapidly but made few warranted, robust points but had lots of filler.

Aff - you did not both agree to the burdens in the cases. Be careful - theirs was NBI.  
- Careful of going new in rebuttals.

RFD - 14% disenfranchisement (potential anomaly) vs. admittedly very small portion of voter fraud. There are already built-in systems to take care of poten. fraudulent polls  
Neg also has no offense