

PFD

FLIP: CP Jagadish - Sridhar v. DT Jagadeesh - Thirumalai

Public Forum Debate			Chanise McClure (*AK)		
Double Octos			LL 112		Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	<u>Thirumalai</u>	<u>19</u>	1st	<u>Jagadeesh</u>	<u>18</u>
2nd	<u>Jagadeesh.</u>	<u>19</u>	2nd	<u>Sridhar</u>	<u>18</u>
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
Affirmative Negative					
(Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? <u>NO.</u>			BASIS Schisdale. School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Thirumalai - Look at judger in cross.

Framework - what is prioritization? 1st or

Bapat - Flows to Aff. mil. aid → 67% increase in duration of terr. conflicts.

Senegal.

Armed Nation - Army used for peaceful, development missions. This is indigenous - not product of mil. Aid. Army used to develop the nation. This goes to Aff. ~~Armed Nation~~

Stone bunds - Don't increase yields 50% - only slightly - do decrease erosion significantly. So what? Aid can help? Stone bunds are farmer-made - non-res.

Development assistance - Bad or good? Probably, often good. Esp. recently in Sahel.

RFD-

In Intl. Aid $\rightarrow$ ↑ duration of conflicts

PFD

FLIP: AO Muddukrishna - Sharma v. AG Artigue - Ramaswamy

Public Forum Debate		TK Berl (*CX)	
Double Octos		LL 60	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Ramaswamy	---	1st
2nd	Artigue	---	2nd
The winner of this debate was		Judge's Signature	
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		Leland / Coach School / Affiliation / Occupation	

(:SS 1001

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Ramaswamy: great job in 1st CX.

ZAC was "ballin"

Very impressed w/ time management / word economy!!! Great job.

* These are mostly suggestions!
* RFD (oral) *

Muddukrishna:

So, if wages are not being solved, but ~~agg~~ aid still ~~the~~ a food, then isn't it still helpful as Aff suggests?

Mitigatory (is that a word?)

~~defense~~ defense is not a reason to reject aff

for negatc; I would

recommend saving that

for last in a summary

& sticking to offense.

-Also, try not to look upset during ^{other's} speeches. You looked super punky during CX.

Ramaswamy: Great job in summary; I would (if possible) try to

extend the turns on security that your partner puts (their

entire round strat is "security good" but they don't show MA →

↑ security; if you have a turn, use it (turns their whole strat) & extend it.

"government purity"

PFD

FLIP: DD Karbo - Dupree v. AA Shen - Ziaee

Public Forum Debate			Joel Guy (*AC)	
Double Octos			LL 102	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative
1st	Taha Ziaee	20	1st	Sarah Dupree
2nd	Jamie Shen	19	2nd	Alex Karbo
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature CPA (*AC) / NRA / Biotech guru School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				

Comments & Reason for Decision:


Con - Dupree please take control in CX - rested all your time as a result. From the getgo, I'm concerned about your case. The warrants are expressed as weak or non-existent in speech 1, meaning that they'll have a very easy time discounting your claims. Rebuttal 1 uncovered the problems points ^ didn't share up the issue. "we can eat the apple because we now have the apple." This is a linchpin you either need to drop in CX or hit harder. She's filling the airspace - get in there Karbo.

Pro - You don't need to dom. CX. At some point your control of the discussion shifts the tone from "informed" to "pretentious".

RFD: I vote Pro for several reasons. I hate the skewed defns, but Con drops them, forcing them to focus on life. As Pro says then, short term beats long term, something I disagree with... but is dropped. The proven help is what matters, not efficacy. Con also can't quantify lives saved while Pro can. C1 ^ C2 this plan thr. Nigeria seemed somewhat important, but we don't care about poverty under the definition. I think C4 attacks by Con are ineffective besides the weapon prodif. argument, but the poverty → fewer impact is, again, dropped. Con case has no solid warrants ^ drops C2 ^ C3, making an easy decision

PFD

FLIP: DD Karbo - Dupree v. AA Shen - Ziaee

Public Forum Debate			Keith Ayen (*CA)		
Double Octos			LL 102		Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	ZIAEE (4)	18	1st	DUPREE (3)	19
2nd	SMEN (2)	20	2nd	KARBO (1)	20
The winner of this debate was Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)			 Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			 School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AMAZING JOB BY BOTH TEAMS => THIS WAS THE MOST DIFFICULT DECISION TO PICK THE WINNER FOR ME YET => BOTH SIDES PRESENTED VERY STRONG CASES AND SUPPORTED THEM WELL BOTH SIDES DEFENDED THEIR POSITIONS VERY WELL.

TO ME, IT'S REALLY A "TIE" AS I COULD FIND FEW FAULTS W/ EITHER TEAM'S CASE.

DECISION GOES TO "NEG" BECAUSE I FEEL NEG IS A MORE DIFFICULT POSITION TO ARGUE.

PFD

FLIP: DD Karbo - Dupree v. AA Shen - Ziacee

Public Forum Debate			Matt Anderson (*CA)		
Double Octos			LL 102	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Ziacee 4	16	1st	Dupree 2	18
2nd	Shen 3	17	2nd	Karbo 1	19
The winner of this debate was			K La Gujin Judge's Signature		
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)			CN School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Is this a low point win? no					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Ziacee slow down a bit! :)
stumbling a little over all those stats & emphasizing words where you need a breath rather than importance.

Algeria confusion...
You are super confident make sure that doesn't turn into overconfidence

[GOOD ARGUMENTS ~~But~~ well backed & passionately expressed but I think you had advantage
Shen & I didn't hear anything
- solution not in the end

good body language
very passionate

Good apple analogy (✓)
good passion but careful w/ some comes off as overconfident patronizing allow opp. to and answer

Great job w/ what I think is the harder argument.
Dupree Thank you for adjusting to me
great eye contact, very articulable
fin strong! don't trail off @ end

Both VERY CALM BUT assertive ~~not that~~ attitude refreshing
Karbo

Clear well thought out counter arguments
thanks again for adjusting to me
Great on your feet
clear cross

efficiency
coherent
& efficient
Bang for buck

(Z)

1. Food security
2. Uniaf
3. develop increases democracy
4. military counter productive increases weapons

official def?
algebra?

is judge wheeling

Prioritize → (long term?)

(S)

- military aid
- people matter
- people die
- intervention
- provide health care
- disease easily prevented
- French interv.
- rice tray

(DUPREE)

1. solve
2. filling power vac. Haven of Jihad
3. ~~Have~~ Exacerbates vulnerability

no

peacekeeping armed troops?

-2 NO

dependent failure

Seemed like you learn & grow over time

Prioritize

(what needs to be done 1st)

(K)

- Somalia food aid $\frac{1}{2}$ diverted
- Nigeria poverty rose w/ aid
- health care infrastructure
- baseline of military aid investment
- long term
- weapons proliferation
- like CIA FBI

PFD

FLIP: CN Guo - Sadler v. DT Huang - Chona

Public Forum Debate		Satheesh Aradhyula (*AD)	
Double Octos		LL 104	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	<u>Sadler</u>	_____	1st
2nd	<u>Guo</u>	_____	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? _____		School / Affiliation / Occupation _____	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- * 'peace keeping troops, a part of MA, increase ag. production & reduce risk of conflict/war,' consider said. they win this argument
- * DA is ^{actually} ineffective, creates dependencies, and leads to more corruption of national governments. ~~Then~~ Con wins this argument as well. That corruption makes DA ineffective is ~~also~~ a further point that Con wins.
- * I tossed Haiti example out because, when questioned, pro side did not show its relevance to Sahel region.
- * Pro side argued that MA increased terrorism. Con did not counter this well

PFD

FLIP: CN Guo - Sadler v. DT Huang - Chona

Public Forum Debate			Angela Buzan (*DC)		
Double Octos			LL 104		Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Sadler ④	17	1st	Huang ③	19
2nd	Guo ②	19	2nd	Chona ①	20
The winner of this debate was			Angela Buzan Judge's Signature		
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒			Perry HS School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner)			Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Sadler - no "choice" - effects long term

① Climate Change - starvation year 2100 - good
 - 40% GDP agriculture → terrorism
 - no progress cited

② Poverty is the root - X2 global population to triple - good
 - 7. food \$, 200% 3X unrest = conflict
 - import \$/work humanitarianism

Guo \$148B What type does that matter?
 - terrorism = military aid → destabilization
 - terrorism 40%
 - related to lack of education
 - conflict aid = develop. assistance
 - poverty, inequality, education
 - Short-term

Sadler - both already there
 - corruption
 - cash for work instead employ infrastructure
 - Solvency: short term: crops
 - long term: Bio-fuel
 - Re: drugs - worldwide - no bother solving.

Chona Can't prioritize 2 things? - ridiculous
 - analogy flopped
 - Re: Climate change - timeline impact low
 - adapting will hurt production
 - foot aid: disincentivizes farmers
 - 75% agriculture fails
 - "Dutch disease"
 - \$105 develop
 - \$5 military - ignore
 - bunk - in Euros not dollars
 - no correlation to the study

Huang equal prioritized? interesting
 ① Dev. assistance
 - corruption
 - \$148B lost, 25% GDP, military aid 186%
 - ↑ terrorism 11.5%, ↑ 585% since aid →
 ② Drug trafficking
 - 1/4 Europe cocaine → Africa
 ③ Peacekeeping
 - \$18B → conflict
 - infutile until stabilization
 - agrit. protec.
 - ↑ 6.5% crop protection ↓ 35%
 - 1% = poverty ↓ 4%
 - conflict
 - ↓ 70%
 - ↓ 86% war
 - ↓ 80% genocide

Guo yes it will fail but

Sadler - no solvency plan Harvard study's incoherent

Guo hyperbolic says

Guo audit and what

Guo ineffective

Guo where is this going

Guo I don't agree that they're giving general statements.

PFD

FLIP: CN Guo - Sadler v. DT Huang - Chona

Public Forum Debate			Arthur Chandra (*DX)		
Double Octos			LL 104		Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Sadler 2	18	1st	Huang 120	20
2nd	Guo 3.18	18	2nd	Chona 417	17
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>			 Judge's Signature  School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Comments given in Round.

Well done to both teams

I voted on Priority as what is both more important and which ^{needs} more value.


The Aff shows the more pressing threat of poverty, and provides for a better solution through a tangible/successful program of cash for work programs and the shift to bio-fuels.

Also the harm of balloon flying at MA ^{as flying} terrorism is a harm on the Neg that cannot be regional MA, also does not prevent genocide in the Sahel region. MA just doesn't seem to provide any pros.

~~Forward~~
 This came down to the best solution for short and long term ^{regional} results

PFD

FLIP: DH Yang - Haider v. AD Relich - Aradhyula

Public Forum Debate		Quinn Buniel (*DT)	
Double Octos		LL 103	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Aradhyula	_____	1st
2nd	Relich	_____	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative Negative			
(Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? _____		 Judge's Signature Harker School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AR

1) Your overviews were arguments

Nay

- Good coverage in the rebuttal.

2) Memorable in grand crossfire

RFD: Econ: The pro doesn't respond to the correlation vs causation argument against their 5.5 trillion stat.

Prereq- Con is doing a better job of explaining the warrants to their unique prereq claims. The pro is also "winning" their prereq arg, but the tiebreaker in this case is the full exp. in summary and FF by the con.

40% HPN cond- Calling it sketchy in the final speech w/o looking at it is not ok. Also the warrants for the argument were in the crossfire.

Didn't evaluate the con's 1st contention because the responses made by the pro were dropped.

~~LEBEDA, ROBERT~~ *Andrea tas, kristin*

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DH Yang - Haider v. AD Relich - Aradhyula

Public Forum Debate		Robert lebeda (*DZ)			
Double Octos		LL 103	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM		
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	<u>Aradhyula</u> 2	<u>18</u>	1st	<u>Yang</u> 3	<u>17</u>
2nd	<u>Relich</u> 4	<u>17</u>	2nd	<u>Haider</u> 1	<u>19</u>
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <u>Negative</u> (Circle Winner)			 Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			<u>Chaparral / teacher</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aradhyula: constructive can get a little confusing → is military needed or not?
could have been more forceful in cross

Relich: very clear constructive
good job - emphasis on decreasing poverty

strongest pt - better economy → ↓ violence
weakest pt - need development aid 1st

Yang: could have been clearer and more concise in crossfire
very important observations in constructive

← both teams
be careful during cross -
no speeches,
quick? &
answer, also -
avoid interruptions
& don't argue about
arguing or how
someone is debating

* remember - you can
absorb development aid benefits
* could have emphasized
multi-national effort

Haider: great passion
good job on cross - fully developed answers, but
be careful of giving speeches

strongest pt - training
weakest pt - ↑ violence in reaction?

(4)✓
(3)✓
(4)✓
(3)✓
(2)✓
(3)✓
(2)

JUN
ROLFE, KATHERINE

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DH Yang - Haider v. AD Relich - Aradhyula

Public Forum Debate		Katherine Rolfe (*CN) <u>JUN</u>			
Double Octos		LL 103	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM		
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	<u>Aradhyula</u>	① 18	1st	<u>Yang</u>	③ 16
2nd	<u>Relich</u>	④ 10	2nd	<u>Haider</u>	② 17
The winner of this debate was <u>Affirmative</u> <u>Negative</u> (Circle Winner)			Judge's Signature <u>Se Young Jun</u> HHS School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Is this a low point win? <u>YES</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEG

- Access to short term impacts
- Alleviate extremism
- Security concerns
- Urgency - Terrorism
- Dev aid harms governance
- EU-precondit. govt
- Mil aid - Foundation

NEG

- 40 tons of drugs (trafficking)
- Prereq to Dev aid
- \$20 per person
- only 40% of dev aid is effective w/o mil aid

AFF


1 min 15 left

- Prioritize - importance
- Prevents warfare
- Mil aid not useful WITHOUT dev aid
- Warfare still goes on; mil aid ineffective
- Not depend on illegal activities
- 5.5 tril \$ ↑ is possible
- 25 mil people in Sudan - logical reasoning

AFF logical reasoning - conclusion/final summary bit weak
NEG statistical evidence - correlation was a bit vague - conclusion was very strong though

PFD

FLIP: FK Niu - Nagarajan v. DT Lam - Raghiv

Public Forum Debate		Brandon Garrett (*CP)	
Double Octos		LL 105	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	<u>Vishal</u>	_____	1st
2nd	<u>Keven</u>	_____	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? _____		<u>Presentation HS</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Ill Rained

PFD

FLIP: FK Niu - Nagarajan v. DT Lam - Raghiv

Public Forum Debate		Suzanne Sikora (*DH)	
Double Octos	FK	LL 105	DT Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker Negative Points (0-20)
1st	Vishal Nagarajan	_____	1st Emaad Raghiv
2nd	Kevin Niu	_____	2nd Alexander Lam
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative Negative			
(Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? _____		Suzanne C Sikora Judge's Signature Boris Scottsdale School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Nagarajan - rude in crossfire, overbearing - almost counterproductive.
- Evidence stronger supported in NEG, supported privatization
 - Affirmation agrees that MH is needed.
more current evidence
 - ~~NEG~~ Aff tried limiting NEG proposed det of military assistance
based on incorrect information

PFD

FLIP: FK Niu - Nagarajan v. DT Lam - Raghib

Public Forum Debate			Rajan Sheth		
Double Octos			LL 105		Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	NEG	Points (0-20)	Speaker	AFF Negative
1st	Raghib	4	19	1st	Nagarajan 3
2nd	Lam	1	20	2nd	Niu 2
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature	
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)				Chaparral School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? _____					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Ultimately, I think this round came down to terrorism/violence and stability/security (politically, agriculturally). I think AFF won the terrorism argument - they provided good + diverse empirical evidence (drugs, coups, terror) and Neg's attacks were often describing more general trends than facts. Neg's evidence in violence (IMF, troop training, human rights) was often nonspecific to Sahel Region. Liked Patricia's figure but seemed biased. In terms of stability, AFF won C1 in agriculture but I believe they lost C2 and C3.

Fouad CX pretty useless - would do better if you didn't interrupt.

Handwritten notes on the left side of the page.

Handwritten notes on the right side of the page.

Handwritten signature or name.

Handwritten text below the signature.

Handwritten signature or name.

Handwritten text below the signature.

Main body of handwritten text, appearing to be a letter or report, spanning several lines.

PFD

FLIP: AD Mazza - Russell v. DT Xie - Bashar

Public Forum Debate			Wade Jernigan (*DC)		
Double Octos			LL 45		Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	(4) Zabin Bashar clear	15	1st	(2) Anjel Russell articulate	16
2nd	(3) Stanley Xie clear	15	2nd	(1) Zy Mazza aggressive articulate	17
The winner of this debate was					
Affirmative Negative			WDJ		
(Circle Winner)			Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? _____			Perry		
			School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Development Assistance Priority

- ① increase school/decrease terrorism
- ②

B. over population - Contraception
 HIV? 470k died
 40-60 fall in income
 Prep
 1:15

95% of Terrorism = Foreign Military Response

→ Military Not Required
 - Poor Educated

Asking Negative to Prove why Military
 :15

"No Corruption" = What?

Supported only a Portion of Your
 argument.
 Needed Facts

Should not be Prioritized, Prioritized Military

- ① Military Aid is Beneficial
 - A. - Stop civil conflict stop death
 - B. Economic -
 - C. Encourages Environmental - cleaner Energy

- ② Add economic revenue - attractive
 - 16 million hungry
 - Causes Corruption
 - Environmental :23

Taking Bate: Military and Not Added

Assistance = harm what?

Thousands to Millions } Trained
 200 million

"All forms"

Supported Your Position better

"Poison Assistance is a weak argument"

PFD

FLIP: AD Mazza - Russell v. DT Xie - Bashar

Public Forum Debate		Nicholas Petsas (*AS)	
Double Octos		LL 45	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	<u>Bashar</u>	_____	1st
2nd	<u>Xie</u>	_____	2nd
The winner of this debate was		_____	
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? _____		<u>Salpointe / U of A</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Stop giving speeches in Cross Ex.

RFD: The Pro won the round by showing more total lives saved from vaccing for malarria & cholera, HIV & agricultural aid vs. the Con's arg that \$ leads to conflict, when it was outweighed by the negative.
affirmative

KARJALA, DENNIS

Coleman

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AD Mazza - Russell v. DT Xie - Bashar

Public Forum Debate		Dennis Karjala (*CS)		
Double Octos		LL 45	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker Negative Points (0-20)	
1st	Bashar	_____	1st Russell	_____
2nd	Xie	_____	2nd Mazza	_____
The winner of this debate was				
Affirmative Negative				
(Circle Winner)				
Is this a low point win? _____		Judge's Signature Hired School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The Aff never talks about why military aid is bad, while the Neg does bring up why dev aid is bad. Aff doesn't answer, just tries to wiggle out. Neg wins on risk of bad dev.

PFD

FLIP: AO Sheets - DeSantis v. FK Conklin - Dong

Public Forum Debate		Tracy Palmer (*FO,DT)	
Double Octos		LL 113	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker Negative Points (0-20)
1st	Conklin		1st Sarah Sheets
2nd	Dong		2nd Jacqueline DeSantis
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		Thag Palmer Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		Fairmont Prep School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The negative wins on Framework, Definitions and on refutations. The neg out debated the aff across the debate.

The aff made some vital mistakes. They tried to change what military aid was at the end of the debate without questioning it along the way.

The neg did a great job in crystallize the arguments at the end of the debate, to solidify the voting issues for me. You are excellent debaters that show how to win while still being calm.

PFD

FLIP: AO Sheets - DeSantis v. FK Conklin - Dong

Public Forum Debate			Jonathan MacMillan (*AA)		
Double Octos			LL 114 175	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Conklin 1	20	1st	Sheets 2	20
2nd	Dong 4	17	2nd	DeSantis 3	19
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Dougherty Valley HS Coach/Teacher School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Affirmative <u>Negative</u>					
(Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? No					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Conklin	Sheets	Dong	DeSantis
I. Agricultural Development Aid - Sustained dev. programs ↑ food and lower famine II. Impeded Governance - Poverty trap; corruption - Aid paves path out of trap - Aid programs ↓ corruption III. Military Aid is harmful - Humanitarian abuses ↑ where US military is	→ UN Humanitarian Air Force helping more people → France has killed terrorists Prioritize: Highest importance HA = Hum. Asst. - Short Term Utilitarianism I. MA is a prerequisite - Military needs to fix corrupt gov'ts first - Gov'ts don't hand out aid II. MA enables Hum. Aid	(Unorganized speech - did not know where to put on flow) → Free food is dumping food in area - Farmers are put out of business	→ Neg is solving for malnutrition - Must "feed w/ fish before training to fish" → No explanation of how aid lowers corruption - Aid usually goes thru gov'ts → 1. ~~~~~ 2. Drones, not weapons 3. Correlation, not causation → France killing terrorists Drones → What type of aid? → Must keep people alive first - training farmers increases competition among farmers too
• OECD is DA only • Drones and military don't lower ~~~~~ • French Intervention is non-topical	• No reason why to cut off half of definition • 6 mil vs. 2.5 mil • Hunger kills 200k/year? needs to be addressed first • Mali terrorists • Drones in Niger • President of Mali wants int'l help	• Solvency: Mali is not M.A. - No link to ↓ violence • HA → ↑ dep.	• Neg solves for immediate issues • DA doesn't solve corr. - Root cause of corr. is instability step 1: • Pave way for aid • Util - Neg solves for imm probs first (hunger vaccines)

PFD

FLIP: AO Sheets - DeSantis v. FK Conklin - Dong

Public Forum Debate		Alyssa Martin	
Double Octos		LL 413 <u>275</u>	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Conklin	(2) 16	1st
2nd	Dong	(3) 15	2nd
The winner of this debate was		Points (0-20)	
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		1st <u>Sheets</u> (4) 13 2nd <u>DeSantis</u> (1) 18	
Is this a low point win? _____		<u>Pam Mux</u> Judge's Signature <u>Boris Scottsdale</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The "affirmative" side provided more substantiated evidence and concrete facts with supporting cites. The "negative" side relied on "common sense" as stated in their final summary. The common sense is correct but in order to sway me, I wanted more facts.

All parties were knowledgeable but nervous. They needed to slow down.

PFD

FLIP: CP Saraf - Allen v. FO Bach - Chung

Public Forum Debate			Becky Andrade (*DC)		
Double Octos			LL 106	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Saraf	20	1st	Chung	20
2nd	Allen	20	2nd	Beck	20
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>			<i>Adam Burt</i> Judge's Signature <i>Independent</i> School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I believe the Aff provided better solvency for terrorism which linked them into the impacts of famine and human rights abuses seeing as terrorism makes them worse. For either framework, I believe Aff comes ahead, Con did not show why military aid helps to improve developmental aid in short run either. Thus, I vote Aff

PFD

FLIP: CP Saraf - Allen v. FO Bach - Chung

Public Forum Debate		Jami Schulman (*AG)	
Double Octos 1	LL 106	2	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Saraf	20	1st
2nd	Allen	20	2nd
The winner of this debate was		Negative	
Affirmative <u>Negative</u>		Judge's Signature	
(Circle Winner)		Chaparral HS - student	
Is this a low point win? _____		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I voted for the Neg aff of security & how they are better able to provide solvency & free by providing security to the region & fighting terror groups. I didn't think the Aff was really able to provide their own solvency or proving how dev and is effective in improving the region.

- ORAL critique

- Wish I coulda given you both the win - good luck!

PFD

FLIP: CP Saraf - Allen v. FO Bach - Chung

Public Forum Debate		Neiko Chotras (*CC)	
Double Octos		LL 106	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker Negative Points (0-20)
1st	Saraf	25.0/25.0	1st Chung 14.50
2nd	Allen	25.0	2nd Bach 20.0
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? _____		Hamilton School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- What prioritizing is happening doesn't come up until very late.
- Cause of terror is never really addressed

RFD: I affirm. Most my ground is just about limiting efficacy of developmental aid. B/c I have to look for long term solutions, and all my logic/slog is based on a/c arguments, I affirm.

1. 1944 1945 1946 1947 1948 1949 1950 1951 1952 1953 1954 1955 1956 1957 1958 1959 1960 1961 1962 1963 1964 1965 1966 1967 1968 1969 1970 1971 1972 1973 1974 1975 1976 1977 1978 1979 1980 1981 1982 1983 1984 1985 1986 1987 1988 1989 1990 1991 1992 1993 1994 1995 1996 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 2025 2026 2027 2028 2029 2030 2031 2032 2033 2034 2035 2036 2037 2038 2039 2040 2041 2042 2043 2044 2045 2046 2047 2048 2049 2050 2051 2052 2053 2054 2055 2056 2057 2058 2059 2060 2061 2062 2063 2064 2065 2066 2067 2068 2069 2070 2071 2072 2073 2074 2075 2076 2077 2078 2079 2080 2081 2082 2083 2084 2085 2086 2087 2088 2089 2090 2091 2092 2093 2094 2095 2096 2097 2098 2099 2100 2101 2102 2103 2104 2105 2106 2107 2108 2109 2110 2111 2112 2113 2114 2115 2116 2117 2118 2119 2120 2121 2122 2123 2124 2125 2126 2127 2128 2129 2130 2131 2132 2133 2134 2135 2136 2137 2138 2139 2140 2141 2142 2143 2144 2145 2146 2147 2148 2149 2150 2151 2152 2153 2154 2155 2156 2157 2158 2159 2160 2161 2162 2163 2164 2165 2166 2167 2168 2169 2170 2171 2172 2173 2174 2175 2176 2177 2178 2179 2180 2181 2182 2183 2184 2185 2186 2187 2188 2189 2190 2191 2192 2193 2194 2195 2196 2197 2198 2199 2200 2201 2202 2203 2204 2205 2206 2207 2208 2209 2210 2211 2212 2213 2214 2215 2216 2217 2218 2219 2220 2221 2222 2223 2224 2225 2226 2227 2228 2229 2230 2231 2232 2233 2234 2235 2236 2237 2238 2239 2240 2241 2242 2243 2244 2245 2246 2247 2248 2249 2250 2251 2252 2253 2254 2255 2256 2257 2258 2259 2260 2261 2262 2263 2264 2265 2266 2267 2268 2269 2270 2271 2272 2273 2274 2275 2276 2277 2278 2279 2280 2281 2282 2283 2284 2285 2286 2287 2288 2289 2290 2291 2292 2293 2294 2295 2296 2297 2298 2299 2300 2301 2302 2303 2304 2305 2306 2307 2308 2309 2310 2311 2312 2313 2314 2315 2316 2317 2318 2319 2320 2321 2322 2323 2324 2325 2326 2327 2328 2329 2330 2331 2332 2333 2334 2335 2336 2337 2338 2339 2340 2341 2342 2343 2344 2345 2346 2347 2348 2349 2350 2351 2352

and get him to make a good change in existing law.


[Faint handwritten notes at the bottom of the page]

1. The first step is to identify the problem or question that needs to be answered. This involves understanding the context and the specific requirements of the task.

[illegible]

PFD

FLIP: DS Carlton - Schieke v. DN Torpy - Apple

Public Forum Debate			Broderick Krager (*AJ)		
Double Octos			LL 2		Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Torpy 1	18	1st	Schieke 2	17
2nd	Apple 4	16	2nd	Carlton 3	16
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)			 School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Schieke - Good points, but low impact. What damage ~~are~~ are caps doing? (Sorry if I'm spelling that wrong). Great use of peacekeeping. You really showed how it does good in the world economy. Budget your time better for summary and organize.

Torpy - Nice tie! Your case is very good and you provide all the necessary links and evidence I am looking for. Great job! Great point in crossfire that aid might not mean results. Your summary is organized, but it focuses too much on your own case.


Carlton - Great rebuttal. You have your facts straight, and great work with their investment point. But you're missing one key aspect - Does your side solve the terror problem? I don't know. Take some offense in Grand Crossfire.

Apple - Dah, very progressive with evidence. Nice use of speed. Thank you for bringing in counter-evidence. Very powerful. And you need to press more evidence against their case argument. They're going to nail this one so much, so you need to stop it before it lays eggs.

RFD - lives - pro wins - 200k lives helped beats out the economy - can wins - peacekeeping saves a lot more money than microfinancing, and I never heard long-term impacts caps ~~training~~ - pro wins - successfully turned by pro to show that American peacekeeping effectiveness - pro wins - while it is economically sound, it is subject to abuse and corruption, and I don't have any impacts on the existing violence in the region.

PFD

FLIP: DS Carlton - Schieke v. DN Torpy - Apple

Public Forum Debate		Kylie Conway	
Double Octos		LL 2	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	<u>Torpy</u>	_____	1st
2nd	<u>Apple</u>	_____	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative			
(Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? <u>Yes</u>			
		 Judge's Signature <u>ASU</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Most of the AFF case ~~is~~ is showing benefits & in areas and make a good claim that if more ~~points~~ aid is focused here the benefits would be larger. They also showed me great negative effects of troop training and peace keeping after it is done. No long term benefits coming from the Negative. Neg should have hammered that the AFF admits the peacekeepers are under supplied...

Lawrence
IYER, NATASHA

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DS Carlton - Schieke v. DN Torpy - Apple

Public Forum Debate		Natasha Iyer (*AX)			
Double Octos		LL 2	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM		
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Torpy	17	1st	Schieke	18
2nd	Apple	17	2nd	Carlton	20
The winner of this debate was			Judge's Signature		
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒			Harker		
(Circle Winner)			School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Is this a low point win? NO					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Apple - you didn't ask
anything


Carlton - keep more calm
during the CX
You are so snarky. Stahp.

Oral

K

PFD

FLIP: FK Gilbert - Gowda v. AX Akella - Garg

Public Forum Debate				Simone Saldana (*AH)			
Double Octos				LL 43		Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	FK	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	AX	Points (0-20)
1st	Gilbert	3	17	1st	Garg	2	18
2nd	Gowda	4	16	2nd	Akella	1	19
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Carter School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? NO							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

First speaker did a great job on delivery of her speech. Evidence was good. Crossfire did an excellent job on questions. Grand crossfire was very good.

First speaker excellent job on delivery of speech. Evidence was really good. Crossfire did an excellent job on questions. Grand crossfire was excellent.


Second speaker great job on delivery on speech, very organized. Great rebuttal against the other side. Crossfire was really good. Grand crossfire was very good.

Second speaker fantastic job on your delivery on your speech. Very strong rebuttal against the other side. Evidence was very good. very good in crossfire. Grand crossfire was good.

The reason for my decision is that I felt that they were a stronger team, & that they proved their side better - the evidence was more underst.

PFD

FLIP: FK Gilbert - Gowda v. AX Akella - Garg

Public Forum Debate		Lisa Lincoln (*FC)	
Double Octos		LL 43	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Gilbert 3	16	Negative
2nd	Gowda 4	15	Garb 2
			Alkella 1
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒			
(Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? No		 Judge's Signature Hamilton School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff.

Neg.

- Gilbert, + Good conversational tone
- + Logical ^{1st} crossfire
- + Gowda, conversational tone
- Asks for evidence from Neg
- + Cross-analyzes Neg's evidence
 - ↳ Not recent
 - ↳ Not relevant to Sahel
- Let your opponent answer your question!
- ~~Brk~~ Gowda, poor crossfire, let your opponent ask the whole question

Prep Time: 50 sec
40 sec
30 sec

~~What a great debate~~
Garg, you
- ~~you~~ speak really fast to get out your content; however, you stumble on your words a lot because of this. Slow It. Down.

- Garg, this is a debate, keep it professional. "Sure, whatever." is not an okay response.

+ Akella, good tone + volume; however, make sure to enunciate

~~+ Crushes it~~

+ "Correlation does not imply causation"

+ Akella stayed calm during crossfire even though Gowda was rude

+ Akella, great composure during crossfire. If you can keep super calm during a crossfire like that, you'll definitely boost your points.

+ Great focus, Garg.

Prep Time: 37 sec
40 sec
43 sec

+ great Grand fire
crossfire
2

+ Great concession in final

PFD

FLIP: FK Gilbert - Gowda v. AX Akella - Garg

Public Forum Debate		David Barclay (DK) DESIREE SRINIVAS (CN)	
Double Octos		LL 43	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Gilbert	11	1st
2nd	Gowda	16	2nd
		27	29
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative <u>Negative</u>			
(Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>			
		 Judge's Signature Hamilton School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Throws out opponent research due to lack of country
- Ability to use analogy to further explain and address topic.
- Prioritizing one with worse issues first - developmental
- counter argument - by helping developmental the gov is then less corrupt
- opponent outdated research
- military = terrorism, not developmental
- opponent w/ hypothetical evidence of military aid being effective
- have examples from Sahel, whereas opponents do not.
- Do not address issue of why development should be addressed first

- definitions used to present arguments - effective
- "Vote con if pro can't prove that develop. comes first."
- Arguments to show both can exist, but that military aid proves to exist or be integrated first.
- Not able to pull based on understanding but more so need to use data
- uses analogy against Aff.
- shows current status w/ developmental is ineffective
- Both partners utilize definition to promote foundation of military aid as the stability
- Akella - good eye contact!
- Ability to reject some research on other end
- Made faces w/ opponent responses
- working together - mil & devel.
- Try be a little more respectful in response & accordance w/ opponents.
- Sometimes the reactions took away from building your credibility

PFD

FLIP: DT Bopardikar - Misra v. CO Bryant - Riggs

Public Forum Debate		Roger Yang (*DH)	
Double Octos		LL 108	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	<u>Bryant</u>	<u>17</u>	1st
2nd	<u>Riggs</u>	<u>19</u>	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? _____		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirmative Team

Bryant: Excellent Presentation, strong points, need more quantitative data to support the points

Riggs:

Very strong rebuttal, excellent presentation.

Negative Team

Bopardikar:

Excellent Presentation, strong rebuttal.

Misra

Strong Presentation, able to pin point to the key points in the rebuttal.

~~Bopardikar / Misra~~
1st Bryant / Riggs

① Women - status
Population - ?

political -
full participation

② General violations
sexual
dehumanized
desexualized

③ Military → impact (conflict)
female
economical impact

4 cases UN & ? in Sudan

main agriculture force (?)

women

political - decrease corruption

2nd
Bias? Political and Economical Stability
huge role in the society (?)

displaced : ?

Military → destabilize the region

Cross Fire

1st. Economical

women's contribution to the economy. %?

% of improvement of woman status will

improve % of economy?

2nd
Impact from women?

Bopardikar / Misra
1st ① Military conse.

2% below

army c

② Displaced reason

150 K.

35% — reduce conflict

food 13% decrease
in resources → hunger
decrease the terrorism

③ Peace Keeping Troops

→ 1.3% ↑ — 6.7% Agriculture
1% ↑ — 4.5% ↓ poverty

2nd

- weight from women ←
- solvency
- Equal Education

• development from woman
% to show

1st

- Financial Aid

Cross-fire

2nd

- reduce instability

PFD

FLIP: DT Bopardikar - Misra v. CO Bryant - Riggs

Public Forum Debate		Taylor Chen (*AD)	
Double Octos		LL 108	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Bryant	19	1st
2nd	Riggs	19	2nd
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature Cathline Foothills School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? _____			


Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff: team very passionate, but could tone it down just a bit. Felt that the case was built towards a "hot" topic and that one could not be against women.

Neg: Delivery good, but could be more polished. Overall, vote for negative, felt the Aff focus was narrowed down and too focused.

PFD

FLIP: DT Bopardikar - Misra v. CO Bryant - Riggs

Public Forum Debate		Mitchell Dyer (*DF)	
Double Octos		LL 108	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker Negative Points (0-20)
1st	Bryant	_____	1st Bopardikar _____
2nd	Riggs	_____	2nd Misra _____
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____		 Judge's Signature Mesquite/Birround Briefs School / Affiliation / Occupation	

-30

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff - I think you should hit their case first in rebuttal.
 It was entertaining though, I guess.

Neg - You can't answer "PKO's rape women" w/ "lets add more PKO's!"
 Also, you need to work on how you say "develop".

RFD: Stability is the pre-req to any further development. according to you guys. If I vote aff, we empower women, stop rape, get equality, and promote stability because they of their work in politics. If I vote neg, it's ambiguous if violence stops because terrorists are empowered by military aid and I don't really endorse PKO's raping women. Aff does have solvency. Neg does not challenge the solvency of the links between promoting women's rights making the region better, so I obviously affirm.

PFD

FLIP: CN Guo - Sun v. DH Meyer - Sikora

Public Forum Debate			Matt Mayhood (*CH)		
Double Octos			LL 107		Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	<u>Guo</u>	_____	1st	<u>Sikora</u>	_____
2nd	<u>Guo</u>	_____	2nd	<u>Meyer</u>	_____
The winner of this debate was					
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)			<u>Matt Mayhood</u> Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? _____			<u>foothill Highschool</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The aff won the frame work if one has to come first then it clearly takes
 priority over the other at that point in time

need to give reasons why your argument beats theirs

Both teams were great but aff solved climate

diseases
 and econ with agricultural advancements
 as well as terrorism

SHOELL, HANNAH

↑ nope, it's actually me

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: CN Guo - Sun v. DH Meyer - Sikora

Public Forum Debate			Hannah Shoell (*DA)		
Double Octos			LL 107	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Sun	—	1st	Sikora	—
2nd	Guo	—	2nd	Meyer	—
The winner of this debate was <u>Affirmative</u> Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? —			_____ Judge's Signature _____ School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Sun: you spend more time asking question than you allow her to answer. that trades off with your ability to get an answer.

Guo: you are very good at cross examination. Your final focus was very good - very nice prioritization of arguments.

Sikora: Makes me you don't let your opponent take over your crossfire. Your arguments are very smart, but you let your partner sort of walk all over you, try to increase your presence in the round.

Meyer: try to make your answers in cross examination shorter. It seems like you got very frustrated in this round, remember it's just a game, don't let the other team get under your skin.

I vote aff. I think they win the root cause, and the hydra affect.

PFD

FLIP: CN Guo - Sun v. DH Meyer - Sikora

Public Forum Debate			Craig Skelton (*DN) Alex Daniel DT		
Double Octos			LL 107		Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Sun	X	1st	Sikora	X
2nd	Guo	X	2nd	Meyer	X
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? ☒			 Judge's Signature Harker Student School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Sun: Solid case. Well-organized, well linked w/ good evidence. Good clarity and volume, but more animation/personality would have helped.

Sikora: Like the arguments and has good analysis, but evidence seems to be inserted just to have evidence. Evidence does not seem strategic or intriguing. Good voice, although drifted to monotone.

Guo: Your analysis is sound when you are using cards but trails off significantly when you aren't, still, you covered the flow in a significantly more thorough manner, good job. Good composure, good job not crossing the line from aggressive to rude.

Meyer: ~~Sikora~~ Rebuttal was scattered and responses were shallow. Literally all three contentions were responded to with one argument: "they don't show how dev. assistance improves this." While I agree that they could have impacted better, your responses allowed them to flow through EVERY impact b/c of generic responses that missed base. Also, at times you were extremely rude.

Sun: Solid. Nice analysis, great balance between offense/defense. Only improvement is FRAME ARGUMENTS as VOTES. Fill out my ballot for me.

Sikora: Your analysis didn't go deep enough. A lot of this speech was regurgitation w/o actually performing in-depth analysis of WHY you were winning a point. This speech failed to take debate to voter level. You were way over the top in Grand C-X, both of you were.

Guo → Don't bring me back to November, use Grand C-X. Your card. I didn't judge in Nov, no idea what you were talking about.

Guo: Good job. Very very good coverage for a fitous

Meyer: your FW did very little "there's no way" → "my opponent's haven't" → "my opponent's exagger." these aren't arguments, they are just argumentative. Almost zero analysis

RFD: Aff won this round by providing superior analysis and going much deeper in the argument. Neg's responses included minimal analysis. Ultimately, Aff successfully denied Neg offense on counter-terrorism by turning it w/ dispersion argument and pointing out Neg could not prove any solvency. Also, Climate Change flowed through untouched with proof of Chinese efficiency in this area having a direct, tangible impact on economy in positive way.

PFD

FLIP: CP Waters - Elzarka v. AX Brobst - Bedard

Public Forum Debate		Tiffany Tibbetts (*FG)			
Double Octos		LL 47	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM		
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	<u>Bedard</u>	<u>19.5</u>	1st	<u>Elzarka</u>	<u>19</u>
2nd	<u>Brobst</u>	<u>20</u>	2nd	<u>Waters</u>	<u>20</u>
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)			 Judge's Signature GCA		
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Brobst - you are a great speaker and you have good ideas, but you ~~can~~ come across rude and overly impassioned. It doesn't help your case to come across as if you are annoyed.

Both

spending time on every speech to belabor a definition debate is typically a waste of time.

Both sides debated very well. On prioritize - I agree that it means which one to put more emphases on (even if we are doing both.)
 I make my choices based on key voters.
 Aff: convinced me that there is an ineffectiveness in military aid (no long term solvency) and that there are current dev. issues ~~around~~ So both should be done but w/ priority on Dev. Aid.

PFD

FLIP: CP Waters - Elzarka v. AX Brobst - Bedard

Public Forum Debate			Jeffrey Kuperman (*AO)		
Double Octos			LL 47	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Bedard 2	19	1st	Elzarka 4	18
2nd	Brobst 3	18	2nd	Waters 1	20
The winner of this debate was					
Affirmative <u>Negative</u>			 Judge's Signature		
(Circle Winner)			Carlsbad HS School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AffNeg

- Did not address Dependency turn
- Did not provide timeline of when these deaths were ~~research~~ going to occur or how many of these lives would be saved if DA prioritized.
- ~~you~~ you guys took the position "DA has potential", which came across as weak and unconvincing.
- Found genocide argument convincing
- Should have had a little more solvency, but because other team didn't either I couldn't fault you that much.
- I bought the idea that DA would be more effective if MA implemented first

Both

~~DA is not really a good idea~~

- Overall great job and congratulations on making it this far.

PFD

FLIP: CP Waters - Elzarka v. AX Brobst - Bedard

Public Forum Debate		Joel Underwood (*DD)	
Double Octos		LL 47	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Bedard 2	18	1st
2nd	Brobst 4	16	2nd
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature DD School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- I'm basically being asked by the Pro to weigh this round based on tiny differences in latitude and lack of deaths to PROVE that terrorism is BAD?? That pushes me Con already.
- Stabilizing the region first is compelling. The semantic difference between Humanitarian and Developmental aid is less so.
- Con has stronger impacts. Pro is resorting to legalism, smoke and mirrors.
- Why am I hearing about Iraq and Libya in the LAST SPEECH?
- Eggs → Babier isn't the 'causality' they mean...
A little willful misunderstanding, I think...

PFD

FLIP: CP Jagadish - Sridhar v. DT Jagadeesh - Thirumalai

Public Forum Debate		Syed Hussain (*DH)	
Double Octos		LD 112	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Thirumalai ①	18	1st
2nd	Jagadeesh ②	16	2nd
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____		Judge's Signature Basis Scottsdale, Programmer School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- There arguments are strong and logical.
- They provided the evidence with there cases.
- They are brief and concise
- ~~Also~~ There argument shows the long term impact of on the region.
- There argument shows the negative impact on the population by the military and.

PFD

FLIP: CP Jagadish - Sridhar v. DT Jagadeesh - Thirumalai

Public Forum Debate		Jonathan Garza	
Double Octos		LL 112	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Thirumalai	_____	1st
2nd	Jagadeesh	_____	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		<u>Independent/Student</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	


Comments & Reason for Decision:

- A lot of this debate became a he-said-she-said in terms of evidence. This makes the round confusing.

RFD: Both teams agree on security needing to come first. This forces the aff to show instability caused by military aid in order to flow their impacts through. In order to do this, they relied on the Bapat & Jacobson cards. However, Bapat's ultimate conclusion is that ^{military} aid does work and Jacobson points to the Rwandan genocide in 1994 to assign 1 million civilian deaths to the UN peacekeepers because of lack of action. That said, AFF does successfully prove that giving military aid prevents coups. Since the failure in AFF's responses, both contentions flow through proving that military aid increases security.

PFD

FLIP: DH Lee - Lee v. DT Lu - Liu

Public Forum Debate			Brian Gavlick (*DS)		
Double Octos			LL 10		Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	<u>Liu</u>	<u>20</u>	1st	<u>Lee</u>	<u>18</u>
2nd	<u>Lu</u>	<u>19</u>	2nd	<u>Lee</u>	<u>17</u>
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Desert Vista HS School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Liu

Excellent delivery. ~~Good~~

Good clear pace.

Lu

Creative, well-supported rebuttals

Lee ♀

Clear delivery, but I had trouble catching all 3 of your observations in the ~~the~~ beginning

Lee ♂

Impressive first speech though I needed a little more of a roadmap/signposting for your transition between discussing obs, discussing Neg C3 & discussing Aff case. Careful with tone in crossfire.

I strongly encourage both teams to keep paper copies of all evidence, preferably with some highlighting, to supply to the opposing team. Handing laptops back and forth is awkward & time-consuming.

Both teams agree ~~the impact~~ that short term impacts are important. I agree that Aff has to prove something - Aff can't win merely on a wash, but Neg doesn't seem to want to prove anything, just absorb Aff's positive impacts. On ~~Aff case~~, I considered the locusts argument on Aff to be a wash, and I considered Neg C1 on Nigeria to be a wash. HBN card on Neg shows that Dev. Aid is inefficient, but Aff shows in C1a & C2 that even small improvements have drastic effects. So what creates a more stable environment? ~~Days. Or rather, well,~~ Neg shows that Mil Aid stops drug trafficking. So I compare the harms of drug war to nominal, inefficient gains on the Aff. I think the small changes will create more stability, so I must affirm.

PFD

FLIP: DH Lee - Lee v. DT Lu - Liu

Public Forum Debate		Mahir Qureshi (*FD)	
Double Octos		LL 10	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Liu,	18	1st DH Lee
2nd	Lu,	16	2nd S Lee
The winner of this debate was		Judge's Signature	
Affirmative Negative		Hamilton	
(Circle Winner)		School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? no			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff: interrupted ignored some statements

Neg: addressed all issues

Both Teams:

all fast speakers, but clearly understood. Better research on facts, quotes, and statistics. More detail and examples given.

PFD

FLIP: AO Muddukrishna - Sharma v. AG Artigue - Ramaswamy

Public Forum Debate		AJ Wakefield (*DS)	
Double Octos		LL 60	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Ramaswamy	_____	1st
2nd	Artigue	_____	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		Desert Vista School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Util framework flows, Aff shows that the ~~door~~ room is more important than the door.
 If chronology ^{is} ~~is~~ used to define prioritize, Neg wins.


Aff shows that ~~the~~ the reason military is present is because of the need for dev. aid, which sounds like a prioritization enough for me.

KO
DAVIS, NICK

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AO Muddukrishna - Sharma v. AG Artigue - Ramaswamy

Public Forum Debate		Nick Davis			
Double Octos		LL 60	Sat 01/11/14 11:00AM		
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Ramaswamy	_____	1st	Ramaswamy Muddakrishna	_____
2nd	Artigue	_____	2nd	Artigue Sharma	_____
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Affirmative <u>Negative</u>					
(Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? _____					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

when are you going?
on 2AC

please listen to answers on
2AC CX!!!

temple 1AR

* what's place ↑
on importance?

voters ∅
w/advp

who has taken econ?

Neg was pre-req neg.

∅ dth.
∅ tenor

1:20.

:40.

(5)

Left Column Headers	Right Column Headers
[Faint handwritten text]	[Faint handwritten text]
[Faint handwritten text]	[Faint handwritten text]
[Faint handwritten text]	[Faint handwritten text]

Handwritten notes and signatures in the bottom right section of the page.

only a few
[illegible]

Q. [illegible]
[illegible]

Swanwick and [illegible]

per [illegible] was [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]