

Novice

LD

E limbs

Light A: Start ASAP  
Open Parliamentary

Connor 103 ~~W~~ ~~ELIM~~ LP Finals  
SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL NOV

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

YGD Dattatreya Diablo Valley Kannappan  
DVC kannappan

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker:		
	Speaker:		

**NEGATIVE**

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker:		
	Speaker:		

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

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

Signed: Ryan Reid

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I vote Acc because I believe  
that obs 1 regarding the 14th ammendment and obs2  
that the ~~cont~~ contentions uphold national security to be true  
I also believe the

Flight A: Start ASAP  
Open Parliamentary

Connor 103 ~~W~~ ~~ELIM~~ LD Finals  
SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL Nov

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

YGD Dattatreya  
AFFIRMATIVE

Diablo Valley Kannappan  
NEGATIVE

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

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

The better debating was done by the AFF from YGD Dattatreya  
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:

Many of the Aff's observations were not refuted and the Neg was unable to provide sufficient evidence to support their Value criterion.

Connor 103 ~~11~~ ~~2111~~ LD Finals  
SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

Ashlyn Turner

Nov

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

AS:

NEG:

YGD

Dattatreya Diablo Valley Kannappan

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker:		
	Speaker:		

NEGATIVE

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker:		
	Speaker:		

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

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

Signed: Ashlyn

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The ~~neg~~ aff needs to spend more time refuting the neg's case. But the neg spent way too much time on their own case, so much so the first two contentions were ~~retained~~ dropped. I buy that the aff solves soft power and that the spill over arg outweighs.

Room: O Connor 104  
Flight A: Start 4:00pm  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

SEMI

MSJ-LD-07, 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

Palo Alto Liu (Claire Liu) vs. Diablo Valley Kannappan (Anand Kannappan)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Claire Liu

Anand Kannappan

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

(NEG)  
He convinced me with the evidences and examples. Every argument was supported by a fact. Clearly showed National security is more important.

(AFF)  
She is emotional and good debater, but lack of evidence & supporting facts weakens the arguments.

Room: O Connor 104  
Flight A: Start 4:00pm  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

SEMI

MSJ-LD-06, MSJ.

Anchy Hong

# 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

Diablo Valley Kannappan (Anand Kannappan) vs. Palo Alto Liu (Claire Liu)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**


Claire Liu

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Anand Kannappan

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: ~~Diablo Valley~~ 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

- \* Voice is good
- \* Covered many points
- \* Slightly weak in defence.
- \* good points: find the other side
- \* need my value for support.

NEG

- \* good questions
- \* some detail examples.
- \* defence is good.
- \* political and normal, social ones
- \* some repeats.
- \* emphasized citizen and non-citizen arguments are strong

Room: O Connor 104  
Flight A: Start 4:00pm  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

SEMI

WARRIOR 2, DEI

# 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 Liu (Claire Liu) vs. Diablo Valley Kannappan (Anand Kannappan)

AFFIRMATIVE

Claire Liu

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Anand Kannappan

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Henry Chen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG — Anand is a good Debater who is not emotional. He is able to focus on main topic and using a lot more aspects to support his statement such as Constitution, government legitimacy, political obligation, National Security

AFF — Claire is also a good debater but show a little bit emotional than NEG. She should convince of me by using more strong sources like NEG did.

Room: O Connor 104  
Flight B: Start 4:45pm  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

SEMI

MSJ-LD-07, 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

Palo Alto Zhang (Hannah Zhang) vs. YGD Dattatreya (Rahul Dattatreya)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Hannah Zhang  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Rahul Dattatreya  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Radha Kelu

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG. Passionate debater, ~~in~~ very well  
Proved his points.  
Excellent evidence & supporting facts.

Room: O Connor 104  
Flight B: Start 4:45pm  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

SEMI

MSJ-LD-06, MSJ.

Andy Hong

# 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 Zhang (Hannah Zhang) vs. YGD Dattatreya (Rahul Dattatreya)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Hannah Zhang

Rahul Dattatreya

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: AFF

- \* morality
- \* safe power
- \* constitution
- \* weak in defence

NEG

- \* asked good question.
- \* voice is good.
- \* good passion.
- \* national security.
- \* ~~clearly~~ clearly better. in many aspects

# 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

YGD Dattatreya (Rahul Dattatreya) vs. Palo Alto Zhang (Hannah Zhang)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

Hannah Zhang

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

**NEGATIVE**

Rahul Dattatreya

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Hensen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG — Rahul is a good speaker and time management.  
He is able to use NDAA to support his Value.  
His clear statement for National Security and  
Morality is impressive.

AFF — Hannah is also a good debater. good time  
mangement. but needs improve some aspects  
to convince of the judge group.

Room: O Connor 105  
Flight B: Start 12:45pm  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

QUAR

Stoddard-Phillips, Susan  
~~1, Evergreen~~  
Summit Prep

# 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.

Mountain View Khan (Julia Khan) vs. Palo Alto Zhang (Hannah Zhang)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Hannah Zhang, P.A.  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Julia Khan (M.V.)  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Sm Stoddard-Phillips

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The neg argument was more substantive.

Both: Good eye contact, Hannah, you had a tendency to sway back & forth. Julia, you need to be prepared (babbling about not feeding your timer + pens is distracting).

Hannah: your case was good + this was a close call. I think you could have found more support for your contentions.

Julia: you have a commanding presence + were able to make more out of cross than opponent.

Both: Good debate, Thank you.

Room: O Connor 105  
Flight B: Start 12:45pm  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

QUAR

Schwing, Emily

TOM HABASHI  
GRANITE BAY HS

# 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.

Mountain View Khan (Julia Khan) vs. Palo Alto Zhang (Hannah Zhang)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Hannah Zhang

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Julia Khan

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Tom Habashi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff. made a superior arguement, reasoned well and provided evidence to support her case  
Neg made better use and was more effective  
Cross examiner

Room: O Connor 105  
Flight B: Start 12:45pm  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

QUAR

Pachauri, Shalin

# 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.

Mountain View Khan (Julia Khan) vs. Palo Alto Zhang (Hannah Zhang)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Hannah Zhang  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Julia Khan  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: Great round!

Aff and Neg each should spend more time sign posting/voters

Aff- Your criteria arguments were really strong but you spent too much time on them. You never touched on the negs card attack for your C2.

Neg. Great job dropping ~~her name~~ removing C2 as a reason for me to vote in this round. ~~It brought down~~

RFD: Social contract is maintained with the increase of soft power. Aff is Resolutonal and meets all criteria.

Room: O Connor 105  
Flight A: Start 12:00pm  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

QUAR

Stoddard-Phillips, Susan  
~~1, Evergreen~~  
Summit Prep

# 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.

Diablo Valley Kannappan (Anand Kannappan) vs. Westmont Green (Austin Green)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Austin Green, Westmont  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Anand Kannappan, Diablo Valley  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Sm Stoddard-Phillips

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Anand: very clear argument, stated succinctly. You demonstrated that you are well researched, excellent cross, effective examples. In addition, you listened well to your opponents' points & addressed each one well (e.g., torture). You are an outstanding debater.

Austin: good eye contact & nice conclusion to your opening statement. I didn't find your argument as clear or well understood as your opponents. Suggest you watch out for your facial expression & body language as there were times that I saw a bit of sarcasm. Better to be professional at all times.

Thanks to both for a good debate!

Room: O Connor 105  
Flight A: Start 12:00pm  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

QUAR

~~Schwing, Emily~~

TOM HABASHI  
GRANITE BAY HS

# 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.

Diablo Valley Kannappan (Anand Kannappan) vs. Westmont Green (Austin Green)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

Austin Green

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

**NEGATIVE**

Anand Kannappan

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Tom Habashi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg has done a superior job explaining, analyzing the case - He made a much better use of his time cross examining and refuting Aff's case.

Affirmative, while articulate in making his case, seem to misunderstand the value statement that he was affirming "Extending U.S. citizen rights to non-citizen" and argued instead for restricting citizens rights to equal those given to non citizens

Room: O Connor 105  
Flight A: Start 12:00pm  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

QUAR

Pachauri, Shalin

# 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.

Westmont Green (Austin Green) vs. Diablo Valley Kannappan (Anand Kannappan)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

Austin Green


NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

**NEGATIVE**

Anand Kannappan

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff - Although I buy your criteria arguments a bit more time could have been spent explaining why they intersect. Nice job not allowing neg to refocus debate to awarding non-citizens ~~rights~~ Citizens Rights.

Neg - Great job speaking. I think there could have been more time talking about the criteria argument. ~~But great job questioning~~ ~~was~~ I would have liked to see more on why Aff was none Resolutional.

RFD. Aff never explained how removing rights of all would be for the greater good. Aff was also not clear on when rights would be granted.

Aff and Neg work on sign posting.

Room: ● Connor 104  
Flight B: Start 12:45pm  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

QUAR

Helo, Eric

Hinojoza, Justin

# 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.

YGD Dattatreya (Rahul Dattatreya) vs. MSJ Sabharwal (Shivane Sabharwal)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

YGD Dattatreya

MSJ Sabharwal

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- It's shady to call your 14th amendment argument an "observation"
  - ↳ be shadey
  - ↳ your 2nd observation does the same thing
- work on time allocation in IAR + JAR
  - ↳ re-do rebuttals for practice
- Spend more time comparing arguments
  - ↳ when neg + aff both claim the other increases terrorism I need to know which does it more.

- slow your roll homie. Your CX is way too aggressive and resulted in a lot of misunderstandings
- Your case doesn't negate. All it proves is that terrorists should be denied DP
  - ↳ none of your case is unique to per citizens
  - ↳ if your case is true non-citizens accused of terror should get the same due process protections as citizens: NONE.
- Really poor coverage in NC; dropped most of the AC
- I admire your conviction but saying that we can do whatever we want to non-citizens is not very persuasive
- you need to actually respond to your opponents arguments

- Aff wins terror impacts with 2nd contention, which is better warranted than Neg terror impacts

Room: O Connor 104  
Flight B: Start 12:45pm  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

QUAR

Alamzai, Mujda

# 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 Sabharwal (Shivane Sabharwal) vs. YGD Dattatreya (Rahul Dattatreya)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

YGD Dattatreya  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

MSJ Sabharwal  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

**COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:**

Ultimately, the negative clearly failed to refute the aff's points leaving 2 completely untouched until he made new arg during his last speech. The aff clearly linked his C's to his VC. While it could have been an easier win had he blown up the dropped arg and illustrated clearly the impacts of this, an affirmative vote was still obvious.

- your opp dropped a large part of your case ... extend it and illustrate why game over issue.  
LINK to VC! Show impacts and how terrible neg world would be b/c these are true  
(ie-terrorist retaliation obvi bad and can even link to his vc nat sec) -> can win on both accounts.

↓  
you really did too much work... he didn't respond to so much. Good rebuttals and defense of case but hardly needed if you had just weighed the dropped arg

- face Judge during CX  
- spent a lot of time refuting observation leaving much of opponent's case dropped. Time management!! Also vc debate not touched while long neg case  
↳ Then attempt to bring up vc in last speech (NO new arg in last spe  
- "His contentions were just not that strong" is not a refutation, you never said to cross apply your responses  
- you didn't ~~answer~~ make it clear whether your voters were also defense of your own case  
- you are a convincing speaker but really need to work on time management. lots of neg arg in 2nd

Room: O Connor 104  
Flight B: Start 12:45pm  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

QUAR

Glenn, Kelsey

# 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 Sabharwal (Shivane Sabharwal) vs. YGD Dattatreya (Rahul Dattatreya)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

YGD

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

MSJ

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

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

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I vote for the AFF side.  
Overall the AFF was more consistent in presenting his framework of justice.  
The NEG was not ~~very~~ a bit weak in arguing against the AFF's position.

# 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 Shah (Paras Shah) vs. Palo Alto Liu (Claire Liu)

AFFIRMATIVE

MSJ Shah

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Palo Alto Liu

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I vote for the AFF. It is a close call though.  
The AFF did a <sup>good</sup> job in defending us constitutional deo process  
is the same as the generic deo the NEG tried to promote.  
The NEG side did a good job in presenting her case, but  
ran a risk of abusing the case. ~~in arguing~~  
She needed stronger argument to differentiate us cons.  
deo process vs her alternatives.

# 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 Shah (Paras Shah) vs. Palo Alto Liu (Claire Liu)

AFFIRMATIVE

MSJ Shah


NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Palo Alto Liu

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: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: This round lacked focus on the vc debate which should have been a determining factor based on their diversity. Both sides also lacked links to their vc. These seemed to be hardly explained, but the neg did slightly link to the reasons safety of citizens is imp. The neg's voters were weak not clearly explaining/laying out the round for analysis. NO extensions were made in the entire round and it was thus, difficult to see which arguments came out cleanly. Ultimately, the neg did decently de-link the aff's case and her CI seemed to have the most clear, unobstructed impacts. Recruitment → Lack of cit safety/↓ nat sec

- face judge during cross ex
- great job answering some difficult cross ex ques
- you don't provide adequate in case links ie- C3 civilian court equipped to try, not thorough or really any link about how this ↓ human suffering... so what
- your rebuttal to her CI sub A (recruit) was basically a turn BUT not labeled as so... could have been a game over issue had it been labeled and better explained
- weak links from case to vc

- you had decent rebuttals BUT → give impact w/ the Wedgewood card you should have linked this back to v (safety) for full effect → his C3 was also weakly linked to vc and would have been useful to point out
- you seemed to focus much more on ur v than vc...
- some strong rebuttals and defense of your case

← → Both sides had trouble painting a clear picture of how case functions in real world... vc wise

Great round for novices!! Impressive knowledge of case

# 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 Shah (Paras Shah) vs. Palo Alto Liu (Claire Liu)

AFFIRMATIVE

MSJ Shah

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Palo Alto Liu

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- Very solid poise & presentation
- work harder on pinning her down do a list of differences between C.D.R.P. & D.P.
  - ↳ she says indefinite detention
  - ↳ you read UNCHR stuff that says this would violate D.P. !!
  - ↳ use IT!!
- You need to do more to counter <sup>neg</sup> ~~the~~ strat, the neg claims that she'll provide the same rights (minus one or two)
  - ↳ you need to explain why those missing rights are critical.
  - ↳ you make  $\emptyset$  arguments claiming a right against indefinite detention
- Additionally you should go after negs who attempt to "affirm less than the aff"
  - ↳ basically neg is saying  $\emptyset$  get 48% of C.D.P.
  - ↳ which concedes that the aff is mostly right

Neg

- use the same rhetoric as your opponent introducing new ideas/phrases like "soft power" is unnecessary and potentially confusing
- answer questions directly,  $\emptyset$  read your case during CX unless asked to
- Your CI  $\emptyset$  really make sense
  - ↳ who is bans proscribed to?
  - ↳ will anyone listen? How many? where does this happen?
  - ↳ why can't courts/prisons segregate terrorists as they do with dangerous inmates and/or gang leaders
- Extend your arguments, explain the warrants
  - ↳ you tend to merely allude to your arguments, while extending them; I want more detail,

RFD:

Neg provides compelling reasons why ~~the~~  $\emptyset$  C. A.D.T. should be denied a right against indefinite detention. Aff provides no arguments which would make this denial either immoral or unsafe.

Room: O Connor ~~107~~ 109  
Flight B: Start 8:45am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

OCTA

~~Mangla, Mr.~~

Schwing, Emily

# 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 Marur (Anant Marur) vs. Westmont Green (Austin Green)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Austin Green

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Anant Marur

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

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



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

• I vote for the AFF

- The AFF did a good job with attacking the flaws within the NEG's contentions and the attacks on his own contentions. The AFF's value criterion was about the same, but the value was very strong w/ that the neg did not attack it at all during the debate. You should make your criteria criteria stronger to hold up better against his Argument. Good job overall w/ your contentions b/c the neg was not able to attack all of them w/ really good evidence.

- The NEG does a good job with proving the value and value criterion of his case. Although the Affirmative value criterion was pretty much the same, the neg kept strong the meaning of the resolution but I'm not sure if that was the way to go.

Room: O Connor 104-109  
Flight B: Start 8:45am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

OCTA

Omohundro-McK

Theresa Hsiao, MSJ

# 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 Marur (Anant Marur) vs. Westmont Green (Austin Green)

AFFIRMATIVE

Austin Green

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Anant Marur

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both sides did great/impressive job.  
I voted for affirmative because of his provides  
more reference to stand his point. regarding national  
security and basic human rights.

The negative needs more reference and ~~ability~~ to  
avoid keep saying his winning the debate. and  
he needs to make eye contact.

Room: O Connor ~~104~~ 109  
Flight B: Start 8:45am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

OCTA

3, Leland Judge

SUNDER RAS (SARATCHA)

# 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 Marur (Anant Marur) vs. Westmont Green (Austin Green)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

Austin Green.

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

**NEGATIVE**

Anant Marur

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff states that Citizens should be treated the same as non-citizens.  
But was ~~no~~ provided no additional details/plan. Military vs. convention etc.

Aff Neg wants to give non-citizen accused of terrorism the military tribunal.

Aff agreed with all the points about the tribunal. (faster, more openness, etc).

For this reason Neg gets my vote.

# 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 Shah (Paras Shah) vs. Leland Huang (Sonya-Huang)

AFFIRMATIVE

Sonya Huang  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Paras Shah  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Jared Filseth

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I bought off framework of rights. However off does not extend any reason why constitution = inalienable rights. Rights v. privilege has no reason why due process must be a right, not a privilege. Since the rights debate was impossible to resolve, I defaulted to the NC framework. The PIC is clearly better because of the classified info argument - aff shows why conventional system is historically effective, but does not say why this means it is better than PIC. Nej does some weighing on this, so I voted off the PIC.

I would have easily voted off if she had extended, or made IAR arguments, to the extent that the government's obligations are to provide rights guaranteed by the constitution. Similarly, neg should have brought up supreme court cases to turn this argument. The rights v. privilege argument had no functionality, since she doesn't justify why dp is a right that extends to all people.

Finally, the neg does not have to defend the status quo - he runs a counterplan instead, and the aff needs to compare between advocacies.



Room: O Connor <sup>106</sup>~~402~~  
Flight A: Start 8:00am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

OCFA

Hinojisa, Justin

# 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 Shah (Paras Shah) vs. Leland Huang (Sonya Huang)

AFFIRMATIVE

Sonya Huang

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Paras Shah

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Nice debate by both, but I was swayed by Affirm's argument that her opponent discussed too many hypotheticals and not enough evidence about the superiority of his plans.

Room: O Connor ~~102~~ 106  
Flight B: Start 8:45am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

OCTA

Filseth, Jared  
~~Deadwiler, Branc~~

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

St Francis Magan (Yanika Magan) vs. YGD Dattatreya (Rahul Dattatreya)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

Yanika Magan  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

**NEGATIVE**

Rahul Dattatreya  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Neer from YGD  
AFF & NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Jared Filseth

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1st note: I really wanted to vote aff, since NDAA arg implies citizens are not given dp, so when we extend the "same" protections to non-citizens, the aff needs to argue not to give them protections, because this is what we do to our citizens. If she'd made this argument, and conceded that Guantanamo is better, I would have voted aff immediately. However, both debaters agreed to debate under a fw in which the aff has to give Article 3 Courts to non-citizens, so I reluctantly vote under this.

Aff concedes util, and the argument that threatens to nat'l security outweigh, so aff fw collapses into nee fw. Nee should have made this clearer.

At this pt, I am highly dissatisfied, being left with lots of arguments about military tribunals, and having to sort through them myself, being completely devoid of any argument interaction/weighting.

Eventually, I voted off the classified into argument-aff defense on that is all mitigatory. Aff does not extend arguments in 1AR, but makes new 2AR ones - I can't vote on either of these types of arguments.

Last note: MAJOR is fought fallacy accepted by both sides - neg does not have to defend torture, even though it's present in the squer.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

YGD Dattatreya (Rahul Dattatreya) vs. St Francis Magan (Yanika Magan)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Yanika

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Rahul

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: Both candidates debated to their best & are good. The affirmative contestant didn't touch aftermath of the terrorist attacks & how it changed lives of the innocent victims & indirectly lives of other people.

Yanika

1st session  
Start: 9:24 AM  
End: 9:30 AM  
Constitutional due processes, morality, rights & privileges  
① Human rights abuse.

Contentions ② Fair & human treatment  
③ Equal protection, dignity & respect.  
could not justify taking innocent lives over terrorist actions.

S: 9:42 AM  
E: 9:46 AM  
Q & A } Good questions: Rahul couldn't justify ~~meas~~ safety over morality, what comes first.

2nd session 9:48 AM to 9:52 AM.  
morality prevails over crime & can prevent it. due process is fundamental rights.  
③ 10:05 AM - 10:08 AM.

Rahul

1st session  
Start: 9:30 AM  
End: 9:33 AM

bringing in more restriction I do not uphold the affirmati in lack of those.  
Q/A → value of 3000 life over suspicious few.  
Good questions: Yanika couldn't provide justified answers.

S: 9:36 AM  
E: 9:42 AM  
Good justification of "Safety" as all values comes after that.  
contentions ①, 2 & ③  
Terrorists does not give in to how you treat them.

2nd session 9:56 AM - 10:01 AM.  
citizen/non-citizens do not equally get the due processes. CIFA didn't allow to close the case.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

St Francis Magan (Yanika Magan) vs. YGD Dattatreya (Rahul Dattatreya)

AFFIRMATIVE

Yanika Magan

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Rahul Dattatreya

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Affirm from St Francis Yanika Magan  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

*[Handwritten Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I am not an expert judge but in my opinion the Neg risked losing this debate merely on the basis of his crossing the line with how he engaged his opponent during questioning by standing too close facing her directly as he spoke loudly and gestured with his hands, including a finger pointed less than a foot from her face. Affirm seemed largely unaffected and remained composed, to her credit. The debate was not won or lost due to the above, instead I was swayed most by Negs reliance upon repeatedly mentioning 9/11 events, The Bin Laden Shrike and his call to Bin Laden and Bin Laden saying that is why 9/11 --- and that being the reason we can't allow these methods.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

Harker Batra (Praveen Batra) vs. MSJ Sabharwal (Shivane Sabharwal)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

Shivane Sabharwal MSJ  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

**NEGATIVE**

Harker Batra, Praveen  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

due process. All legal proceedings: UP NO

Constitution

Value morality code of ethics

#1 torture morally wrong and produces false statements & effects

#2 Fair trial - minimize Human suffering  
Fed Courts  
Examples: 5 examples  
War criminals  
Geneva Convention or criminal law ratified by Congress  
Intl Law

#3 signed does  
provide security, evidence rules

Q. Line morality + utilitarianism  
Classified into Protection Act.  
No of Chicago & a threat vs lightning  
\*paint themselves as victims.

Q avoiding torture & prevents suffering  
Military Tribunal Fair Trial?  
= commit crimes against all of humanity.

Morality  
Utilitarianism  
Greatest # of people and is measurable

#1 addressed #1 weak punishment of terror and defuted types of terrorism - multiple opps

#2 opponents  
#3 contentions

found flaw in logic

#2. MUMNTS. lack power. discredit Military Tribunals

#3. civilian courts - provide Security, evidence rules

Scale -  
Torture ROW & due process tri in night just because they are crims  
We can prevent torture, & due process & use military

\*terrorism against single person.  
injured affected & killed by terror!

Reason for decision in favor of AFF. were his support of his contentions facts and evidence to support. Gave current examples for his position and maintained his definitions throughout debate.  
Able to organize fact & evidence along with painting a clear picture of how when and where these real events are taking place  
and ultimately won the rd. It was extremely good!

Room: O Connor 405 110  
Flight A: Start 8:00am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

OCTA

Mandracchia, Jo

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

Harker Batra (Praveen Batra) vs. MSJ Sabharwal (Shivane Sabharwal)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

Shivane Sabharwal

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

**NEGATIVE**

Praveen Batra

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: S. S. Kadakia

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative

Good details with specific examples  
Answered all cross-examination questions very well supporting  
his stand.

Negative

All criteria were very well argued.  
cross examination questions were not answered well  
Lack of details and information

Affirmative established that United States ought to  
extend to non-citizens accused of terrorism the same  
constitutional due process protections it grants to citizens.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

Harker Batra (Praveen Batra) vs. MSJ Sabharwal (Shivane Sabharwal)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Shivane Sabharwal

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Praveen Batra

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- persons treated - Human rights morality
- ① - value morality ✓
- torture is wrong
- ② Conventional Courts work - 2 points ✓  
     Hong Kong International  
     → military less effective
- ③ Due process Geneva Conventions ✓  
     Case - ✓

- ①. Morality Greater Good
- ① - intl Threat / due process ✓
- ② DISCREDITING terrorism ✓  
     tribunal present
- ③ Guilty prove innocent ✓

While the affirmative had an excellent rebuttal against point #2 of the negative, ... not enough proof; overall I thought the negative presented a stronger case, supported by stronger <sup>evidence</sup> ~~proof~~. He rebutted #1 & #2 of the affirmative very well and was able to defend #1 & #3 during the rebuttal stage.

# 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 Liu (Claire Liu) vs. James Logan Omarkhil (Mirwais Omarkhil)

## AFFIRMATIVE

Mirawis Omarkhil

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

## NEGATIVE

Claire Liu

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: S. S. Kadakia

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

James Logan - Affirmative

Value criteria - Morality - stated clearly

Not well presented but has good details and very effectively answered the cross-examination questions.

Facts presented and defended contentions appropriately.

Claire Liu - Negative

Value criteria - National Security - stated clearly

Presented arguments well with good examples

Each contentions supported very well and argued against the opponents

Room: O Connor 105 110  
Flight B: Start 8:45am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

OCTA

Mann, Supreet  
Mylrea, Ileen

# 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 Omarkhil (Mirwais Omarkhil) vs. Palo Alto Liu (Claire Liu)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Mirwais Omarkhil James Logan  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Claire Liu Palo Alto  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Claire Liu

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

ought accused due process = fairness  
"from the US"  
utilitarianism. greatest happiness. (prevention of pain)  
greatest good for greatest #  
#1 terrorism. causes. inhuman detention.  
#2 NSAs. classified materials. Const due proc  
Q asked for evidence. Great Clash  
ought - Govt as actor = morality to do the right thing.  
Citizen non-citizen accused treated the same ~  
Other steps. & necessary jury  
"Citizens of World ~ look to moral community"  
Cosmopolitanism  
Courts can use flexibility in cases of terrorism  
Specific impacts ~ inhuman to create terror.

Q define in morality "in your words"  
Civilians (citizens).  
Other ways to - (jury of peers.?) forgive non citizens.  
ought. accused terrorism  
terrorism vs common criminals  
Q a complete opposite. American Con due process  
Govt protect citizens - primary priority  
#1 due process or the same commonizability to protect.  
prohibit in prison. already extend due process  
#2. too dangerous to let go. ideals / religions  
preventative detention. magnitude of crime  
Safety - bare minimum vs morality.  
to protect citizens.  
Being nice does not guarantee the ↓ in terrorism.  
Military tribunal. Individuals sensitive in for. need to properly manage. terrorist attack legitimacy of Govt.  
Resolution states - can't change for each instance  
many reasons of that there is no universal morality.  
Safety is superior.

Great Clash from both opponents, well prepared, well spoken. Good Luck to both of you.  
RFD per premise that there is a difference between terrorist and common criminals; Safety vs morality and due process vs Const due process and the facts evidence & support that we hear there.

# 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 Omarkhil (Mirwais Omarkhil) vs. Palo Alto Liu (Claire Liu)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

*James Mirwais*

*Claire*

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: *[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Due process - fairness  
 - morality - utilitarianism -  
 1 - fair trial  
 2 - terrorism - US court - contractual  
 efficient - civilian courts  
 3 - info cross exam - less effective

terrorism - safety U.S. citizen "national security"  
 citizen  
 1 Flexibility +  
 - precise indefinite details  
 - details  
 2  
 3  
 - Good argument vs Morality value  
 - more flexibility, effective

Claire did a good job of arguing for the superiority of her value.  
 Mirwais had some great points, however did not have enough clarity in the  
 cross examination. Claire presented her speech well, however repeated herself  
 in cross examination. Mirwais spoke a little too fast so it was difficult  
 to follow. Overall, Claire's case was more compelling.

# 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 Kannappan (Anand Kannappan) vs. MSJ Asokan (Anu Asokan)

AFFIRMATIVE

Anu Asokan.

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Anand Kannappan

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Katrin M. Kerbert.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff:  
Carefully presented information and supportive evidence - well-paced.

Neg:  
Strong counter argument, well-articulated

R.F.P.

The neg. established that the U.S. gov had an obligation to protect its own citizens first, and by allowing terrorists due-process this would compromise safety, and National Security. Neg provided meaningful evidence to support his contention. Neg provided a more convincing argument.  
Work on: Have an alternative to measure to closing detention centers.

Aff made a valiant attempt at affirming resolution on moral grounds. Work on stronger rebuttal and final statements.

# 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 Kannappan (Anand Kannappan) vs. MSJ Asokan (Anu Asokan)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Anu Asokan / MSJ  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Anand Kannappan / Diablo  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The affirmative argued for Morality and hence Equality for all. The core of the argument was for treating everyone equally, and upholding human rights.

The Negative argued for Govt. Legitimacy and maintaining Natl security. Due process to non-citizen terrorists would harm our National Security.

I vote for NEG because there was good evidence presented on how release of classified info could harm N.S and how ~~the~~ due process procedures could hamper fight against terrorism. He also pointed out that status quo has reduced terrorism, thus benefiting U.S. Citizens. He made a good point of political morality over morality in general in the context of U.S. Govt.

The AFF did not have strong arguments against ~~point~~ these points and was focused more on upholding equality for all people.

Room: O Connor ~~105~~ 107  
Flight A: Start 8:00am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

OCTA

2, Leland Judge

# 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 Kannappan (Anand Kannappan) vs. MSJ Asokan (Anu Asokan)


**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

MSJ Asokan  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Diablo Valley Kannappan  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the neg from Diablo Valley  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Please don't make new arguments in the 2AR. It is unfair and annoys me.  
It might be a good idea to use your rather than get stuck. You have 3 minutes, use them!

Neg is ahead on framework and content-level. Looking to get oblig/nrd. Permit,  
the neg is the only one with other that links to the standard.

Room: O Connor ~~103~~ 107  
Flight B: Start 8:45am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

OCTA

2, Leland Judge

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

Mountain View Khan (Julia Khan) vs. MSJ Jangle (Himaja Jangle)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**


MSJ Jangle

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Mountain View Khan

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the neg from Mountain View  
AFF/NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: 

**COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:**

When asking CX questions don't "go for the kill" because it won't work. Overall very good CX by the neg though.

Dear aff debator,

Please ask questions during prep rather than make arguments.

Thanks,  
Allen.

Read the card, don't just say that you have one  
Don't need a big recap if you're done.

Neg won so I'd continue FW and often look to it.

Room: O Connor ~~103~~ 107  
Flight B: Start 8:45am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

OCTA

Nguyen, Joseph

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

Mountain View Khan (Julia Khan) vs. MSJ Jangle (Himaja Jangle)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Himaja Jangle / MSJ  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Julia Khan / Mtn View  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Judge Samuel

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The AFF's main contentions were 14<sup>th</sup>/15<sup>th</sup> Constitutional amendments, not taking easy way out by giving everyone a voice in democracy and giving everyone basic human rights. She made a good point about non-citizens within U.S jurisdiction who are not terrorists and contribute ~~B~~ positively to U.S society - these people deserve due process protection. She also made a good point about these non-citizens being "merely accused" of terrorism - it is not proven that they are terrorists, hence they deserve due process rights.

The NEG sole contention was that the Govt must enforce the social contract, which applies only to citizens. Also, that in a Democracy - citizens must be higher than N.C. She also assumes that "accused" terrorists are already terrorists and hence don't deserve rights.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

Mountain View Khan (Julia Khan) vs. MSJ Jangle (Himaja Jangle)

AFFIRMATIVE

Himaja Jangle  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Julia Khan  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

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

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff:  
Well- paced supportive information.

Neg:  
Very well articulated argument. Confident presentation.

RFD  
The neg. presented the most compelling argument that the us govt has an obligation to provide the 'right of life' to its citizens. In addition, it is not possible to compare constitutionality to equality. Neg responded well to CX and was quick to analyze opponents contentions. Very well done.

Aff made a valiant attempt to support the resolution. The point made that the social contract was outdated was a weak one, as the Constitution of the US is, as her opponent pointed out, a living document

Room: O Connor ~~404~~ 109  
Flight A: Start 8:00am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

OCTA

3, Leland Judge  
SUNDER RAJ (Saratoga)

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

YGD Gnanansekhar (Aditi Gnanansekhar) vs. Palo Alto Zhang (Hannah Zhang)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

ADITI

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

**NEGATIVE**

HANNAH

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Good job on both AFF & NEG case.

- The torture case by AFF was never refuted by Neg.  
- 5/23/5/3 was a big argument. To people free was argued by AFF that they were innocent & was let go.

- ~~AFF~~<sup>NEG</sup> during the first XF was putting the words in AFF by saying such statement "does terrorist have moral values?".

- Neg's first speech was terrific, but when it came down to 3rd & 4th speech, the arguments of AFF kept standing out & that Neg was not defending her case well.

ex: all people vs. citizens.  
: 70 were innocent  
: Soft power.

Room: O Connor ~~104~~ 109  
Flight A: Start 8:00am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

OCTA

~~Omohundro-McN~~  
Theresa Hsiao, MSJ

# 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 Zhang (Hannah Zhang) vs. YGD Gnanansekhar (Aditi Gnanansekhar)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

Aditi Gnanansekhar

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

**NEGATIVE**

Hannah Zhang

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Both sides did great job!
- I voted for negative because the negative established her argument more completely from different perspectives. The negative demonstrated her point of view more precisely and present a better argument about why Americans were attacked by terrorism and government needs/have responsibility to protect citizens.
- The positive side needs better analysis regarding justice & morality and to provide more reference to stand her point of view about law and order.

Room: O Connor ~~404~~ 109  
Flight A: Start 8:00am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

OCTA

~~Mangla, Mr.~~

Schwing, Emily

# 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 Zhang (Hannah Zhang) vs. YGD Gnanansekhar (Aditi Gnanansekhar)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Aditi Gnanansekhar

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Hannah Zhang

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

• I vote for the NEG to win this debate

- The neg did a good job with using the evidence to support her contentions. Her x-exam was very good with she found the holes in the AFF argument. Her value / value criterion was also very strong and incorporated the AFF's case which made it very strong

- The AFF needs to back up the value and value criterion with a little stronger evidence. The neg was able to attack those b/c they were weak. The AFF's first contention was the strongest w/ the NEG was not able to attack against it at all during the debate. Expect on the State Qs it will make your case strong