

Open  
LD  
Elims

Connor 102 ~~in~~ ~~ELIM~~ LD Finals  
**SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL**

OPEN

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: <u>Pakshit Garg</u>		
	Speaker: _____		

**NEGATIVE**

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: <u>Akriti Singh</u>		
	Speaker: _____		

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

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

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

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~Vote Aff~~ I vote aff because ~~the neg~~ of solvency. The neg ~~argued~~ argued that ~~state~~ ~~disruption~~ would be necessary and that would be a violation of justice & rights that they are trying to argue for. ~~The~~ The aff is improbable and only in a perfect world but if ~~it would~~ the neg would negate all social contracts and the JUSTICE system would crumble because we would all be in violation of morality & no due process would be illegitimate.

Flight A: Start ASAP  
Open Parliamentary

Connor 10.2 in ELIM LD Finals  
SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Open

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

Milpitas Garg

St Francis Singh

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: Rakshit Garg		
	Speaker:		

NEGATIVE

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: AKRITI Singh		
	Speaker:		

The better debating was done by the ARR from Milpitas  
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 wins Val. = win Round

Neg Val is left untouched after 1AR

There are more reasons to ~~vote~~ vote Aff than Neg.


Turn on Sobit Pow. never refuted, Aff extends turn

Aff gets turn

Aff wins under either cri. Because by providing moral Justice he also protects U.S. citizens

For more feed back email me @ mightenya@hotmail.com

Also my personal ~~biass~~ bias is for neg so good Job Aff



Condor 102 in ELIM CD Finals  
**SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL**  
Open

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: <u>Milpitas GARG</u>		
	Speaker:		

**NEGATIVE**

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: <u>St Francis Singh</u>		
	Speaker:		

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

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

ORAL

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ALL DEBATES ARE FLIPS FOR SIDES!!! Please DISCLOSE, BUT: RETURN BALLOTS BEFORE ORAL CI

Milpitas Garg (Rakshit Garg) vs. Palo Alto McNamara (Addie McNamara)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

Mc Namara

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

**NEGATIVE**

Garg

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg made a Comprehensive case for negating the proposal, offered complete analysis and generally better reasoning. He also edged Aff. on delivery

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ALL DEBATES ARE FLIPS FOR SIDES!!! Please DISCLOSE, BUT: RETURN BALLOTS BEFORE ORAL CI

Milpitas Garg (Rakshit Garg) vs. Palo Alto McNamara (Addie McNamara)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

Addie McNamara

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

**NEGATIVE**

Milpitas Garg

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: Thanks for sign posting and voters guys!!

Aff - Impact out all points, and dont let him drop contentions.

Neg - You make more of an impact when you don't spread pick your strongest points and work them to death had she called you out on your drop this round could have been hers.

Cross-ex is your time don't let her use it to go over her case. Never tell a judge that you put half of a T-shell up as a voting issue, you lost the standards debate when you said this.

I voted on CC 2.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ALL DEBATES ARE FLIPS FOR SIDES!!! Please DISCLOSE, BUT: RETURN BALLOTS BEFORE ORAL CI

Milpitas Garg (Rakshit Garg) vs. Palo Alto McNamara (Addie McNamara)

AFFIRMATIVE

Palo Alto McNamara

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Milpitas Garg

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

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

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Ultimately, the negative exploited almost every strategic route winning the framework very clearly w/full extensions, and turns. He clearly spells out the round and how the neg world will be better. The turn on soft power was especially outstanding. Both sides were extremely clear speakers so thank you (especially late in day)!!

-Time management: you failed to extend much of your case in the 2nd aff speech when he left much of your offense untouched → easy enough to extend one arg & weigh it

-you also failed to label a turn to his sub BC2 about resources... could have been good offense

- Great Job extending the framework... you absolutely link to your vc w/full extensions

-Very clear voter analysis

-also thank you for linking to both vc's → great strategy

-weighing your final cleanly extended arg would have been a great final kicker

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ALL DEBATES ARE FLIPS FOR SIDES!!! Please DISCLOSE, BUT: RETURN BALLOTS BEFORE ORAL CI

Palo Alto Sandhu (Jaisel Sandhu) vs. St Francis Singh (Akriti Singh)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

Singh

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

**NEGATIVE**

Sandhu

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff made a realistic, comprehensive case offering many evidence to support the proposal

Excellent presentations by both

Room: O Connor 102  
Flight B: Start 4:45pm  
Open Lincoln Douglas

SEMI

MSJ-LD-05, MSJ

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ALL DEBATES ARE FLIPS FOR SIDES!!! Please DISCLOSE, BUT: RETURN BALLOTS BEFORE ORAL CI

St Francis Singh (Akriti Singh) vs. Palo Alto Sandhu (Jaisel Sandhu)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**


Akriti Singh

Jaisel Sandhu

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: wins standards debate with the distinction of moral v.s. political.  
Neg: You let a lot of points go dropped. You never responded to her points on your CC 1 or 2. Great job calling her cards into question. Many thanks

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ALL DEBATES ARE FLIPS FOR SIDES!!! Please DISCLOSE, BUT: RETURN BALLOTS BEFORE ORAL CI

St Francis Singh (Akriti Singh) vs. Palo Alto Sandhu (Jaisel Sandhu)



AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

St. Francis Singh  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

PALO Alto Sandhu  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed:  

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This round was very messy and knitty gritty. I would have loved some weighing b/c ultimately no arg seemed more imp't than another. I ended up affirming b/c the aff did come out w/ some clear offense about dp & ter (C2) and a tiny bit of C3. Messy round, but great rebuttals on both sides.

-you fail to make complete extensions (C,w,i) → it would have been useful had you picked one arg and extended it to illustrate impacts (C3 would have worked)  
-with such a back and forth VC debate → should have linked more clearly to both → last second you did it

-your sub c 3 D have absolutely no warrants, blips  
-very good job providing multiple rebuttals, gives your opponent a lot to cover (esp liked arg refuting -fact that police wouldn't nec lead to coop) in response to her 2nd cont.  
-you made new arg during 2nd speech for c 3 D, not taking it  
↳ should have used McCarthy in 1st speech as turn  
-your extension of Shide (C2) was never completed ...some weighing would also have been useful

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ALL DEBATES ARE FLIPS FOR SIDES!!! DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY.

Milpitas Garg (Rakshit Garg) vs. MSJ Chopra (Aditya Chopra)

AFFIRMATIVE

Rakshit Garg

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Aditya Chopra

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Aaren Lensing

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: - I feel that you read through your examples way too quickly I did not understand some of them until you repeated your points.  
- Practice speaking it was very  
- great job on the C/X, ~~but~~ he gave you a clear and concise way on how to win the debate  
- good job refuting his points, overall don't spend next time but drop things

Neg: - It seemed like you were reading off your paper and speed reading  
- good job refuting his points, don't rely on that alone though yes overall justice might be wrong, but some for it only was in case we decided to accept it

- C/X, don't give reasons as to ~~why~~ how he can win, say it is on paper.

Decision: Aff has won this debate because they spoke for the issues that neg said would lead to the Aff winning this round. The reasons and examples of "soft power" outweighed "smart power"

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ALL DEBATES ARE FLIPS FOR SIDES!!! DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY.

MSJ Chopra (Aditya Chopra) vs. Milpitas Garg (Rakshit Garg)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Rakshit Garg  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Aditya Chopra  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Kelly Eisenbrand

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Rakshit → should take his handout of his pocket when he speaks
- Very good analysis of Moral Justice → humanity, but needed more links to Impacts, especially as his argument progressed.
- Aditya should have better established morality from moral justice if he wanted to draw a dichotomy.
- Aditya slurs his words a bit and mumbles a little when speaking very fast.
- Rakshit gave much better cross examination Question: more hard hitting and served to better make his own points.
- Could not understand the great majority of Rakshit's speech → non-comprehensible
- Rakshit → never, ever drop a contention, and especially do not phrase it as "dropping" something, because it looks awful.
- Rakshit did not prove that target killing is ineffective -- needed in this case and others that he desperately needed evidentiary support.
- Aditya has excellent evidence. His speed and inflection are nearly perfect.
- The difference between morality/moral justice is not differentiated clearly -- both debaters should have worked on that.
- Aditya - do not concede during cross-ex. It is important not to let a single question decide the round.
- Aditya ultimately gave the better substantive argument, but Rakshit's framework overtook, and culminated when Aditya conceded during cross-ex.

Room: O Connor 103  
Flight A: Start 12:00pm  
Open Lincoln Douglas

QUAR

3, ~~Leland Judge~~

Skolnick, Ryan

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ALL DEBATES ARE FLIPS FOR SIDES!!! DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY.

MSJ Chopra (Aditya Chopra) vs. Milpitas Garg (Rakshit Garg)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Rakshit Garg  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Aditya Chopra  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Agreeing to an extremely limited course of debate in cross and then losing the case. I cannot vote for a neg that wouldn't even vote for itself.

AC	Speaker Advice	NEG
	<p><u>Aff</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Good job with clarity and vocal projection</li> <li>- Decent job at defending in cross x</li> <li>- careful not to allow opp to pin you.</li> <li>- Verbal fillers in cross x. Need to be stronger</li> <li>- Contentions in cross x are very solid!</li> <li>- In coherent spreading over. Very very bad</li> <li>- carded evidence is delivered more clearly could have been a knockout blow</li> <li>- strongest argument was citizenship non-citizens. could have been much stronger if developed more</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Look at us! Don't read</li> <li>- Hand gestures got repetitive</li> <li>- Strong cross x, just look up more. be bolder</li> <li>- when being cross x ed, gave way too much leeway</li> <li>- Don't allow "will survive if" scenarios to go unchallenged</li> <li>- No need to waste time on spamming when you are essentially advocating the same thing</li> </ul>

Room: O Connor 102  
Flight B: Start 12:45pm  
Open Lincoln Douglas

QUAR

Hinojisa, Justin

Auelg Hoy

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ALL DEBATES ARE FLIPS FOR SIDES!!! DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY.

Douglas Frost (Andy Frost) vs. St Francis Singh (Akriti Singh)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

Andy Frost

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

**NEGATIVE**

Akriti Singh

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

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

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: AFF

- & Read statements from note
- & need more organized arguments.
- & good at asking questions
- & getting better in later stage of debate.

NEG

- & asked good questions.
- & strong example
- & good eye contact and rate of speech.
- & Weak in defense

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ALL DEBATES ARE FLIPS FOR SIDES!!! DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY.

St Francis Singh (Akriti Singh) vs. Douglas Frost (Andy Frost)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Andy Frost  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Akriti Singh  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Padma Kalekuntla

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG clearly established that military system can do a better job than conventional courts. Her arguments about citizens not given <sup>(in one case)</sup> due process protection was convincing and not extending it to non citizens makes it right.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ALL DEBATES ARE FLIPS FOR SIDES!!! DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY.

Douglas Frost (Andy Frost) vs. St Francis Singh (Akriti Singh)

AFFIRMATIVE

Andy Frost

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Akriti Singh

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: of demyachen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG - Akriti is a good debater who is able to focus the Big picture of main topic. She states US Law protects US Citizen only. Don't abuse universal human Right on the issue of non-citizen terrorism. She also clearly state the different role of military tribunal and Supreme court, and also Federal court's ruling.

AFF - Andy is good speaking and time management. His argument is lacking of evidence to convince me.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ALL DEBATES ARE FLIPS FOR SIDES!!! DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY.

Palo Alto McNamara (Addie McNamara) vs. Bishop O Dowd Mortarotti (Dominick Mortarotti)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Addie McNamara

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Dominick Mortarotti

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Padma Kelukunt

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

She Successfully convinced her value & Contentment.  
 She proved her value majority can be achieved by extending due process protection to non citizens.  
 She showed that Federal Courts can handle classified information as good as military practice and can be effective.  
 Negative could do a better job in convincingly more human rights, he just focussed on security.

Room: O Connor 102  
Flight A: Start 12:00pm  
Open Lincoln Douglas

QUAR

~~Nguyen, Joseph~~  
Henry Chen MSJHS

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ALL DEBATES ARE FLIPS FOR SIDES!!! DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY.

Bishop O Dowd Mortarotti (Dominick Mortarotti) vs. Palo Alto McNamara (Addie McNamara)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

Addie McNamara

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

**NEGATIVE**

Dominick Mortarotti

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Henry Chen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF - Addie is good speaking. She is able to focus on the Big picture and convince me. Such as Universal Human Right is the Baseline. If the Baseline is ignored, the other choices are no longer making sense. She also points out how important of the US soft power could Boost economy.

NEG - Dominick is also a good speaker. However his late excuse is not acceptable. On the other hand, He emphasize the value of security lacking of strong evidence to convince me.

Analy Hong

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ALL DEBATES ARE FLIPS FOR SIDES!!! DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY.

Bishop O Dowd Mortarotti (Dominick Mortarotti) vs. Palo Alto McNamara (Addie McNamara)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Addie McNamara


Dominick Mortarotti

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

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



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

① universal human rights  
② u.s soft power  
③ voice is good  
appears very confident  
A clear winner

NEG

\* security  
& stability  
Read from notes for most of time  
Weak defense on some points  
accused US guilt needs more explanation

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ALL DEBATES ARE FLIPS FOR SIDES!!! DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY.

Palo Alto Sandhu (Jaisel Sandhu) vs. Westmont Young (Bruce Young)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Bruce Young  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Jaisel Sandhu  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Bruce needs to look up more when speaking, and not bob around so much - - unprofessional
- State your value immediately, clearly, and ~~not~~ not later during cross-exc.
- ~~Do~~ Use evidentiary support rather than small stories → your point has no impact at all without legitimate evidence.
- The systemic impacts argument needed clearer transitions to contentions, which also should have been much more explicit.
- Needed to more closely link dehumanization → loss of Rights (Constitutional)
- Needed to define the terms much, much, much more explicitly.
- You are not a Jehovah's witness → use a debate tone. Do not use "conversion" rhetoric, because it does not easily nor effectively adjust to debate circumstances.
- Jaisel was much better organized, with better structured arguments
- Needs to work on responding to cross-exc. → answer concisely
- Needs to define and furthermore, analyze his definition of morality so that he can effectively argue the implications of a moral-based debate.
- Bruce Young -- Do not drop anything. Do not say the word drop. Address everything
- Jaisel -- should have challenged the pre-first argument → Fiat is accepted debate Rhetoric.
- Jaisel needed evidentiary support for his arguments. -- One example is not sufficient to make a broad statement
- Bruce -- Do not laugh at opponent during his speech...
- The Pre-Fiat argument is not viable. Debate holds no obligation to be impact-ful.
- Jaisel should have contended. → couldn't Sudge on it

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ALL DEBATES ARE FLIPS FOR SIDES!!! DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY.

Palo Alto Sandhu (Jaisel Sandhu) vs. Westmont Young (Bruce Young)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Bruce Young

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Jaisel Sandhu

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Very poor framework by Aff. borderline abuses  
Aff pretty much attempted to ignore the entire debate

Speaker Advice

Aff: Risky premise case, but solidly made  
Strong defense on cross X.  
Problem is: There is absolutely no impact  
of "freeing your mind"  
Ironically, you're allowing for no flexibility  
Extremely sharp offense on cross X.  
Be careful not to portray yourself as a billy  
Solid attempt at highlighting vagueness in  
interior value

Neg: Strong offense on cross X.  
Good job at performing debate to  
normal standards  
~~\_\_\_\_\_~~  
You'd better be prepared to  
defend your criteria in cross X  
You'd better recover at the end  
Attack the framework better.

Room: O Connor 103  
Flight B: Start 12:45pm  
Open Lincoln Douglas

QUAR

1, Leland Judge

Aaron Linsley

Cal Lutheran

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ALL DEBATES ARE FLIPS FOR SIDES!!! DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY.

Palo Alto Sandhu (Jaisel Sandhu) vs. Westmont Young (Bruce Young)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Bruce Young

Jaisel Sandhu

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Aaron Linsley

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: follow debate format, if Neo would have an ~~frame~~ topic it would have been 100% Neo w. l. t. u. r. s. Define the values, done French, next the stay topic have strong ~~points~~ points rebuttals his examples, dont accept his framework

Be clearer

Neg: Great job attacking his framework and establishing your own, call topic next the Aff, was VERY abusive besides that the only problem was your issues on the main definition

Decision: Neo has won because they have evidence substantiated the resolution of this debate.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

Bishop O Dowd Mortarotti (Dominick Mortarotti) vs. James Logan Narayannan (Ajjit Narayannan)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

BOP Dowd Mortarotti

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

James Logan Narayannan

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff was able to successfully explain how drone strikes are not moral due to collateral damage. Neg was not really able to give a good justification as to why military tribunals would be bad other than saying that having them would prevent targeted killing. But as targeted killing is not moral, as aff points out, then this is not a legitimate argument against it.

Great debate. Both sides did an excellent job. Neg's case was compelling, but you need better arguments to take out the targeted killing bad argument.

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

**CCTA**

**Mathur, Preeti**

(PROSPECT)  
SRINIVASAN, MEENAKSHI

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

James Logan Narayannan (Ajjit Narayannan) vs. Bishop O Dowd Mortarotti (Dominick Mortarotti)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Bishop O Dowd MORTAROTTI  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

James Logan NARAYANAN  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: V. Meenakshi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Very well argued by both sides. As the Aff concluded, the LD format is more a value/moral based criterion and the centered approach of the AFF supported that basic ideal. During one of the CronF, the NEG <sup>exulted</sup> said, "I don't care..." - that goes against the very basis of the LD format. Gentlemen, the point is to argue without getting overwrought. It is not as much as bringing down the other person as much as allowing the argument to stand in its own light. ~~and~~ All the very best for future debates and distinctions.

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

OCTA

WARRIOR 2, DEI  
SAJID HUSAIN, EVHS

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

James Logan Narayannan (Ajjit Narayannan) vs. Bishop O Dowd Mortarotti (Dominick Mortarotti)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

DOMINICK

AJJIT

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: *Ajjit*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

6 min:  
VALUE CRITERIA: PROTECT HUMAN RIGHT

3 min  
CROSS EXAMINATION  
WHAT IS HABEUS CORP?  
LEGALIZATION OF HANCI IMMFIELD?  
GOOD QUESTION ON RIGHTS BETWEEN  
MILITARY TRIBUNAL & PUBLIC TRIAL

7 min Rebuttal: CROSS EXAMINATION  
Torture is bad Both side agree  
good questioning:

7 min: PROSEC  
VALUE:  
Minimize the TERROR ACT:  
REBUTAL ALL CONTENTION:

4 min: First Aff: rebuttal  
TERRORISM Explained with target  
killing and long run impact  
Terrorism.

6 min:  
Target killing advantage will  
defend.

3 min Last aff rebuttal.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

Douglas Frost (Andy Frost) vs. MSJ Wadhwa (Karuna Wadhwa)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**


ANDY

KARUNA

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFFIRMATIVE

VALUE CRITERIA : JUSTICE  
VALUE CASE → HUMAN RIGHT

CONTENTION 1:

②: HABIOUS CORR.

JUSTICE SYSTEM ARE MORE CAPABLE  
THAN MILITARY TRIBUNAL.

4 min. for just rebuttal.

- ① STATE good cross examination on slavery is legal in Constitution?
- ② Safety / Security with good examples about putting citizen in steel box.
- ③ 6 min

NEG  
3 min cross - EXAMINATION  
Why value of Justice?  
How to stop becoming n to from  
Court?

7 min for negative speech  
mp: 1.5 min  
VALUE: MORALITY:

CONVENTIONAL: system not deemed  
for trying terrorist.  
Due process has more help  
SLAVERY Taken as good example to more  
MORALITY.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

MSJ Wadhera (Karuna Wadhera) vs. Douglas Frost (Andy Frost)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE


Douglas Frost

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

MSJ Wadhera

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff wins because they really never responded to the argument that civilian courts are safe -> if safe is SO, then evidence that they are not safe doesn't hold.

Also, where would they ~~possibly~~ try them? You don't advocate MT & you say not civilian courts so... where? That was a hole in your case for me, as you don't answer Aff enough.

Also, the Const isn't currently changing. Has changed only 27 times in 200+ years - that's pretty low. Good round.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

MSJ Wadhera (Karuna Wadhera) vs. Douglas Frost (Andy Frost)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Douglas FROST  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

MSJ WADHERA  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: V. Meenakshi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This debated flipped flopped a lot in my view with some good arguments offered by both side. In the final balance, the NEG had 2 good points & AFF had 3. Hence, owing to that final conclusion it will be a ballot on behalf of the AFF.

Good pt. for NEG: After 200, not giving due process actually helped achieve stability / safety for society.

Good pt. for AFF: Upholding democratic rights + the importance of soft power. where order need not be compromised based on for freedom.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

Westmont Young (Bruce Young) vs. Leland Loftis (Cameron Loftis)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Bruce Young  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Cameron Loftis  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Excellent debate between two very strong and sophisticated debaters who clearly listen to each other's contentions and try to refute them while providing further evidence to prove their case.

The Aff side linked better to the value criterion and came out of the round winning. They clearly provided good arguments and evidence to prove their case and were able to refute their opponents contentions.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

Westmont Young (Bruce Young) vs. Leland Loftis (Cameron Loftis)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Bruce Young

Cameron Loftis

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Sharon N. Portner

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff gave a clear presentation in opening and a good summary of his 3 contentions. It was not clear how he equated dehumanization with denial of due process, but Neg did not clearly pursue this gap.

Neg argument in opening had a large and convincing amount of evidentiary support. The cross-examination of neg was not effective in eliciting useful information. Neg

Aff was effective in discrediting a large amount of Neg's evidence as irrelevant, e.g., case cited by Neg were pre-CIPA.

Aff pointed out lack of evidence with regard to specific names.

Neg was able to attack the dehumanization argument in his rebuttal by stating that only loss of some due process rights would lead to dehumanization.

Aff successfully pointed out that CIPA solves all problems mentioned in Neg's contentions and Neg did not respond.

Aff pushed the attack on the OBL escape to increasingly extremes and ~~was~~ Neg pointed it out.

~~I am voting for negative because Aff did not have a strong response to the argument that there was no need to extend all due process protections in the constitution, and that dehumanization would not occur if we only change some of them.~~

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

Westmont Young (<sup>aff</sup>Bruce Young) vs. Leland Loftis (Cameron Loftis)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

Bruce Young

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

**NEGATIVE**

Leland Loftis

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the aff from Westmont  
AFF/NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Bruce McNamee

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

aff: I didn't follow "equal rights no, ~~no~~ due process eyes", ~~etc~~

Neg: No names because "hard to pronounce" is lame - give names or say you don't have them. Not clear why aff has to list what rights are granted; or how that helps case. Good cross, by the way.

Overall, aff case made sense, Neg didn't fully address aff contentions/evidence.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

Bishop O Dowd Nouri (Koosha Nouri) vs. Milpitas Garg (Rakshit Garg)

~~negative~~ negative

~~affirmative~~ Affirmative

Koosha Nouri


NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Rakshit Garg

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

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



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

good debate.

The Neg side won this round as he better linked to the value criterion. The Aff side accepted the Neg side definitions, but didn't link as well and didn't explain or provide evidence as to why.

The Aff side didn't explain why morality outweighs the social contract and I found his argument to be incomplete.

The Neg side clearly provided evidence and good definitions and better linked to the value criterion.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

Bishop O Dowd Nouri (Koosha Nouri) vs. Milpitas Garg (Rakshit Garg)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

Rakshit Garg

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

**NEGATIVE**

Koosha Nouri

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Bruce McQuinn

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: I missed some of the AC because it went a little too fast. Cross had good direction, but not as well articulated.

Neg: Sometimes (got overexcited?) spoke too loud, too fast. Cross not strong - just let aff iterate his points.

Overall:

Aff case was clearer and more logical than negs. Aff rebuttals were more to the point and effective.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

<sup>AFF</sup> Milpitas Garg (Rakshit Garg) vs. Bishop O Dowd Nouri (Koosha Nouri) <sup>NEG</sup>

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Rakshit Garg

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Koosha Nouri

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Scott Bortner

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg was able to follow up on non-responsive answer by aff clearly cross  
Aff had a very clear opening argument.

Neg was unable to respond to all AFF's subarguments (too little time?), e.g. US becomes a terrorist country  
Neg was pointed out ambiguity in definition of due process and limited to 6th amendment due process, this limitation ~~was~~ helped Aff's case more, it was useful in limiting the argument. I'm not sure why Neg introduced it because AFF was able to use it to support his case  
~~AAA had a partial response to turn~~

~~Neg was not effective~~

I am voting for aff ~~because~~ in part because neg did clearly attack Aff's numerous soft power arguments. Aff was also effective in providing evidence that even though laws are on the books, the US does not follow them and torture and other human rights abuses have occurred.

Room: O Connor 105  
Flight A: Start 8:00am  
Open Lincoln Douglas

OCTA

~~Batra, Pragya~~

Bhatia, Kunal.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

Palo Alto Braun (Noa Braun) vs. St Francis Singh (Akriti Singh)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Akriti Singh.

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

①

Noa Braun.

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

②

The better debating was done by the

Aff.  
AFF BY NEG

from

Akriti Singh  
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: K.N. Bhatia

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- References mentioned related to facts presented.
- Presentation was more organized and thought process was logical with current affairs.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

Palo Alto Braun (Noa Braun) vs. St Francis Singh (Akriti Singh)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Akriti Singh

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Noa Braun

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Padma Kalakur

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted 'negative', because she convinced that, with accurate just determination we can achieve increased national security and maximise human rights. She also argued showed military commission is the better system than conventional court system. Affirmative can do a better job of showing how she can maximise the human rights. Also how conventional court system can do better than military commission.

Room: O Connor 105  
Flight A: Start 8:00am  
Open Lincoln Douglas

OCTA

~~Cotta, Irene~~

DESAI, DEEPAK

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

Palo Alto Braun (Noa Braun) vs. St Francis Singh (Akriti Singh)

AFFIRMATIVE

AKRITI SINGH.

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

NOA BRAUN

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Devin Desai

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Pretty close till the end. Neg lost out based on how due process was defined. Part of Neg's Facts supported AFF's contentions.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

Saratoga Munukutla (Venkat Munukutla) vs. Palo Alto McNamara (Addie McNamara)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Venkat M.

Addie McNamara

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Body language / Delivers of Aff was great, but lost out on facts. Quoted Roe v Wade as a civil rights case ~~and~~ related to HR and kept stating that it was a civil-rights case. [related to segregation].

Neg presented arguments well and supported her arguments with factual evidence.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

Palo Alto McNamara (Addie McNamara) vs. Saratoga Munukutla (Venkat Munukutla)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Venkat Munukutla

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Addie Mc.Namara

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AFF from Venkat Munukutla  
AFF & NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Padma Kelekuntla.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative clearly wins this debate, because he convinced how conventional system can protect the leaks of evidence and achieves morality. He clearly justified his arguments and supported with evidences & numbers.

Negative could have more impact by providing better system, but all was concerned about leak in the evidence and contract of the citizens with government.

Affirmative achieved his victory by proving life & liberty is more important and achieved by his method. (or system)

Room: O Connor 105  
Flight B: Start 8:45am  
Open Lincoln Douglas

OCTA

~~Batra, Pragya~~  
Bhatia, Kamal

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

Saratoga Munukutla (Venkat Munukutla) vs. Palo Alto McNamara (Addie McNamara)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Venkat Munukutla

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

①

Addie McNamara

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

②

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

Signed

K.N.L. [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- facts presented were relevant to current affairs.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

MSJ Calambur (Vivek Calambur) vs. Palo Alto Sandhu (Jaisel Sandhu)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Jaisel Sandhu

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Vivek Calambur

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

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

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I vote for the AFF.

AFF provided more effective arguement in differentiate accused vs. actual terrorist, ~~and~~ which will lead to minimization ~~of~~ of public opinion against us soft power.

However, I think the AFF should not introduce the C.I.P.A evidence in the last rebuttal.

Another point, NEG should not drop the arguement against Fed court effectiveness contention.

Room: O Connor 103  
Flight B: Start 8:45am  
Open Lincoln Douglas

OCTA

Mitrea, Ileen

Schletzbaum, Jammie

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

Palo Alto Sandhu (Jaisel Sandhu) vs. MSJ Calambur (Vivek Calambur)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Jaisel Sandhu

Vivek Calambur

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Jammie Schletzbaum

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Jaisel - clear speaker, Good eye contact.  
Good cross ex questions.

4 min speech: Very good job of covering Neg case & you used your time very well.

Vivek - Look at judges during cross ex - not app.  
Ran out of time in 7 min speech, use time more effectively.  
You dropped Affs contention 2 - just saying I have a card is not refuting the contention. - BIG MISTAKE

RFD:

First, neg. dropped Affs Contention 2 in the beginning of debate. They kept arguing it anyway and AFF won it.  
37% conviction rate in Fed Courts. - Most effective way of trials. - Public Safety was essentially the guideline of debate. AFF proved we need soft power to reduce terrorism (reduces backlash). Giving D.P. therefore would reduce terrorism & ensure public safety.

Definition of accused important in round,

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

MSJ Calambur (Vivek Calambur) vs. Palo Alto Sandhu (Jaisel Sandhu)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Jaisel Sandhu  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Vivek Calambur  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Di

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both Aff & Neg agreed on Public Safety.  
Aff didn't attacked Neg's value-orientation which is utilitarianism  
Aff is asking for Soft Power and he says Smart Power  
is Soft Power + Hard Power. So Neg is winning because  
he is supporting Smart Power which has both and  
he wins over Aff's Soft Power.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

MSJ Chopra (Aditya Chopra) vs. Diablo Valley Bhargava (Rohan Bhargava)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Aditya Chopra  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Rohan Bhargava  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Di

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG  
① Very good cross ex by neg.  
② Good speech. But couldn't answer some questions in cross ex by Aff.

APP  
① Excellent cross ex.  
② Very well Perceved that his value & morality is better than NEG's value & government legitimacy.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

Diablo Valley Bhargava (Rohan Bhargava) vs. MSJ Chopra (Aditya Chopra)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Aditya Chopra  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Rohan Bhargava  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Jammie Schletzbaum

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aditya - Char speaker, Good eye contact in cross ex, Good presentation of case.

Rohan - Good cross ex questions. Good eye contact in cross ex. - Be careful with the "ICC" - if you are going to mention this, give other alternatives too so it doesn't sound like a counter plan...

KFD-  
① AFF says there's no way to know if private trials would be unbiased, Neg said we could give D.P. with private trials.  
② AFF provided evidence (KIPA) that classified information was not leaked due to 2010 reforms.  
③ Link shown soft power ~~decreased~~, shift would work effectively and giving non citizens D.P. would extend soft power. Soft power would increase Nat. Sec.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

DO NOT DISCLOSE!!! Please return all completed ballots IMMEDIATELY to the judges room.

Diablo Valley Bhargava (Rohan Bhargava) vs. MSJ Chopra (Aditya Chopra)


**AFFIRMATIVE**

Aditya Chopra  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

**NEGATIVE**

Rohan Bhargava  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I vote for the NEG side.  
NEG provided convincing and consistent argument on the standard of gov. legitimacy.  
NEG was also sharp and clear at attacking morality definition. Particularly, the AFF introduced two points which I think weakened his position.  
1. all people have moral standard, so will not bias  
2. ~~WAR is not a~~ when no crime, there is no evidence problem.