

PFD

FLIP: DZ Lala - Levitt v. CN Bhatti - Ramadoss

Public Forum Debate				Chanise McClure (*AK)			
Round 1				SS 236		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Ramadoss	4	18	1st	Lala	1	19
2nd	Bhatti	3	18	2nd	Levitt	2	19
CN - Ramadoss - Bhatti				DZ - Lala Levitt			
The winner of this debate was							
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)				 Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? No				Bingham High School School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Framework needs to be carried through every speech. Also claims without warrants don't matter.

Neg gives the impacts of current terrorism and how that is solved by M.A. They show security is the most pressing issue and that D.A. is unsuccessful.

Neg shows why it is a prerequisite and how we need to fix the gov so aid can be effective.

PFD

FLIP: FK Gilbert - Gowda v. DG Colvin - Okeefe

Public Forum Debate				Nicholas Petsas (*AS)			
Round 1				LL 102		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Colvin		10	1st	Gowda		19
2nd	O'Keefe		8	2nd	Gilbert		18
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)				Salpointe / UA Honors School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? NO							

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

2nd Speaker. Sign Post!! Tell me where you are going, it was really hard to follow you in the rebuttal. You need to be more organized. Too many times

Too many times
"Um" was said
by both rebuttal
speakers

You as 2nd speaker left 40 secs on the clock in a Rebuttal!!! You could have made

"therefore" was also overused.

No new Ev in Final/Focus

RFD: The Con side of the debate won by proving that military aid was effective, as defined by the Pro, because they showed the countless times aid was ineffective in their 2nd & 3rd contentions & proved military aid always worked so in that case the Pro has no ground & the Con wins.

PFD

FLIP: DS Carlton - Schieke v. DT Lu - Liu

Public Forum Debate				Kris Callan (*AD)			
Round 1				LL 43		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Liu		18	1st	Schieke		18
2nd	Lu		18	2nd	Carlton		20
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)				Catalina foothills School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>							

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro case - Good job!
 Reconstructive aid - priority
 Long term stability
 improve agriculture
 " education
 " food security
 " GDP
 reduce - desertification
 - effects of locust
 - terrorism

} all good points

Peace-keeping only 3% benefit
 Developmental aid without
 any military assistance

Though military assistance
 has its Downside, is it
 reasonable to assume that
No military aid is necessary
 to ensure that Developmental
 aid can proceed?

If you agree that "some"
 military aid is necessary, But
 that Developmental aid is more
 important in the Long term
 you might have a stronger case.

Con case Good job!
 Both kinds of assistance
 necessary (good point)

military aid -

decreases - coups

improves - overall costs
 - risk of war
 Chances of Develop.
 aid to be successful
 - shipments of aid
 NGOs - supported
 By developed nation


Developmental aid - doesn't improve
 educ. levels

- more food, but
 can't access or
 can be destroyed by
 war.

* put all facts + figures into constructi
 + rebuttal + X free not in summary

PFD

FLIP: AD Shibano - Rubalcava v. AC Ferdowsian - Fox

Public Forum Debate				Hannah Shoell (*DA)			
Round 1				LL 247		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Melissa	1	25.75	1st	Melissa Cody	3	25.75
2nd	Johnathan	2	28.60	2nd	Ryan	4	28.60
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)				Copper Hills			
Is this a low point win? _____				School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1N: You let her control cross fire, you're very good at asking questions, but you should ask them as well.

2N: You need to work on word economy, you say a lot of words but not a lot of things. args.


1A: Word economy is also a problem for you. ~~you~~ you say plenty of words, but very few arguments.

2A: Stand up when you give your speeches, you tend to hunch over your laptop.

I vote aff - I think the impacts outweigh.

PFD

FLIP: DZ Tennakoon - Grewal v. FD Shah - Hu

Public Forum Debate				Raj Soni (*DH)			
Round 1				LL 147		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank	Points	Speaker	Negative	Rank	Points
1st	Tennakoon	(1-4) 2	(20-0) 18	1st	Shah	(1-4) 3	(20-0) 17
2nd	Grewal	1	19	2nd	Hu	4	16
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)				 Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				Basis Scottsdale / Physician School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff did better job of framing the debate toward their definition of prioritization - which is more of a positive impact.

Grewal seemed most relaxed, prepared speaker & listened to opponents responses & responded effectively.

Shah/Hu did good job with prepared remarks but could have more effectively attacked aff when they said "terrorism is not threat" and could have done better in initial rounds with the framework (this did get better as the debate went on)

Tennakoon - excellent initial case and evidence to back up claims, need to work on letting opponent answer questions in crossfire & responding appropriately.

PFD

FLIP: CN Han - Foster v. DA Almanza - Raso

Public Forum Debate				Simone Saldana (*AH)			
Round 1				LL 249		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Almanza	3	16	1st	Han	4	15
2nd	Raso	1	18	2nd	Foster	2	17
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>				 Judge's Signature <u>Carter</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

First speaker did a really great job. Evidence was really good. Cross examination was good. need a little work on your cross examination questions.

First speaker did a good job. Evidence was good. Talked a little too fast so sometimes it was hard to understand what was said. Cross examination was good. need a little more work on your cross examination questions.


Second speaker did a good job also. Evidence was really good. Cross examination was really good.

Second speaker did a great job on delivery of the speech. Evidence was really good. Cross examination was really good.

The reason for my decision was that I felt that they had proved their side better, their evidence was a little stronger.

PFD

FLIP: CP Khelghati - Mobarhan v. AK Faulao - Vendemiattti

Public Forum Debate				Rajan Sheth			
Round 1				LL 263		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Mobarhan		18	1st	Vendemiattti		17
2nd	Khelghati		17	2nd	Faulao		18
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)				 Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>				<u>ASU Student</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Root cause is poverty. Dev aid better solves poverty.

Reasons given orally

PFD

FLIP: CA Matteotti - Sweat v. CP Jagadish - Sridhar

Public Forum Debate				Vincent Nguyen (*AG)			
Round 1				LL 160		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	<u>Matteotti</u>		<u>15</u>	1st	<u>Jagadish</u>		<u>17</u>
2nd	<u>Sweat</u>		<u>15</u>	2nd	<u>Sridhar</u>		<u>17</u>
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)				 Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>				<u>Chaparral / Student</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD given in round.
 AFF conceded. I know it's the first round, but AFF,
 don't concede. Fight through it! Practice helps!

PFD

FLIP: CH Henriott - Wilde v. DT Bhatnagar - Wadhwa

Public Forum Debate				AJ Wakefield (*DS)			
Round 1				LL 265		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Henriott		16	1st	Wadhwa		20
2nd	Wilde		15	2nd	Bhatnagar		19
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____				 Judge's Signature Desert Vista School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

+ Aid workers → kidnapping !!

Thanks guys !!

PFD

FLIP: AD Mazza - Russell v. FC Bacon - Colfax

Public Forum Debate				Tracy Palmer (*FO)			
Round 1				LL 109		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank	Points	Speaker	Negative	Rank	Points
1st	Anjelica Russell AD	2nd (1-4)	27 (20-0) (20-30)	1st	Barley Colfax FC	3rd (1-4)	26 (20-0) (20-30)
2nd	Zy Mazza AD	1st	29	2nd	Taylor Bacon FC	4th	25
The winner of this debate was				Tracy Palmer Judge's Signature			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)				Fairmont Prep School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>							

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF: Anjelica: You are a good first speaker and did a nice job on cross fire. You laid out a clear and concise case that was easy to follow. Be careful on your final speech it was very fast and little hard to understand. I did catch your three impacts finally.

Zy: Excellent job. Great speaking abilities. Good job in pointing out the lack of any evidence on your opponents side. You win the Grand crossfire round for your team.

RFD: The Affirmative wins based on framework, evidence and impacts. They won every argument.

CON:

Baily Nice job laying out your FW, but you do not have any evidence to back up your claims. Try to add some to help give you more support in your case.

Taylor: Try to add more content to your second speech to elaborate on your case, not just restate your contentions.

You both get very nervous during crossfire try to practice a little more. Your speeches come across strong, but then you both become very, very, nervous.

Try to add some evidence and strong impacts to your case. It will really help make your points.

PFD

FLIP: AS Pierre - Draper v. DT Lam - Raghib

Public Forum Debate				David Barclay (*DK)			
Round 1				LL 12		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Pierre	15	15	1st	Raghib	17.5	17.5
2nd	Draper	17	17	2nd	Lam	18	18
The winner of this debate was							
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒							
(Circle Winner)				Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? _____				Brophy School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- If you want to link out on scene
arg, know how you create good
dev. arg.
- Be more wise w/ your prep time
- You need to break down the
arg's you have to answer in
summary. And need more
prep time to do it.

- Your obs. of say can't use NGO sources, just get
NGO's as actors
- Don't know about the default neg argument
- Terrorism is to be rooted in gov. but
we need to stop it

Remember, positive for
one is always better

PFD

- Ap. Neg wins case. & shows that dev. aid is as effective.
- Any risk of offense to military and effectiveness means
I vote neg.

PFD

FLIP: CC Goodman - McCollum v. DT Duraiswamy - Misra

Public Forum Debate				Daryn McClure (*DC)			
Round 1				SS 314		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Marc Goodman	②	16	1st	Sreyas Misra	②	17
2nd	Hunter McCollum	③	17	2nd	Kevin Duraiswamy	①	18
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? No				 Judge's Signature HHS School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Development aid vs military aid

Pro

- "Help to grow"
- Basic needs of people / malnutrition
- Terrorism ↓

- Mali - humanitarian aid

- A then B - not chronological
- Sustainability - prioritize extremism
- Provide food - less support terrorism
- only effective "when we are there"
- Humanitarian is basis for devlpmt
- Urgency

- V+ - Prioritize - what needs to be done
- Collateral damage
- "Prioritize" - develop police forces
- Stability w/o physical presence

Con

- Leadership, decapitation
- Terrorism - Drugs trafficking
- Peacekeeping

- 6.7x more ~ leadership killed ✓+

- Development - long term
- Terrorism ⊗ - urgent ✓+
- Greater food security

Humanitarian - short term

greater final good

- w/o resolving conflicts, resources do no good
- Safer region ✓+

Negative - more diverse points, attacking/rebutting almost every point from the opponents while stating/reaffirming own
 Basic affirmative - lingered a bit too much on the topic of "priority", not enough usage of time to clearly stating more points on their view
 spent most time on rebutting

Opening (4 min)

(3 min) cross fire

(4 min) rebuttal

(3 min) cross fire

Summary (2 min)

Grand cross fire (3 min)

(2 min) Final focus

PFD

FLIP: CP Kikkeri - ~~Raymond~~ Taylor v. FO Flores - Lee

Public Forum Debate				Natasha Iyer (*AX)			
Round 1				LL 104		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Kikkeri Taylor	2	16	1st	Lee	4	15.5
2nd	Kikkeri	3	16	2nd	Flores	1	17.5
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature St. Francis School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative Negative							
(Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? NO.							

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning. the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PRO

I think you mean "female genital mutilation" NOT "malnutrition"
 Ask for case to flow; don't ask for order. Looks better to a judge.

~~Don't ask for order. That is bad.~~ BETTER COVERAGE NEEDED!

Main arg should be brought up EARLIER. NOT IN GRAND!

You need to answer better in order to access your "not cause" claim.

Main 1st terr should have been extended in Summary.

CON

dude, let your partner speak in grand
 -1 speakers for Lee b/c speech in CF; no question. ; Bo!

Signpost in speech.

Summary Pointy organized

Why do you concede you provide less aid?

Also, res interp and few aren't the same thing.

Don't waste time in crossfire asking point blank for concessions. You're having the debate rather than setting it up.

Rfd: Lack of clash on Con case and Con response to Pro. Pro doesn't meet burden of showing reason to prioritize if Con wins stability prereq. and ~~int. aid.~~ Pro doesn't sufficiently answer, ∴ con.

PFD

FLIP: FO Bach - Chung v. CN Ngo - Agarwal

Public Forum Debate				Robert lebeda (*DZ)			
Round 1				LL 13		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Chung		19.5	1st	Agarwal		17
2nd	Bach		19.5	2nd	Ngo		17.5
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)				Chaminade / Speech Coach			
Is this a low point win? _____				School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The Neg focused on terrorism, however was not able to provide that their plan is better for eliminating terrorism, while the Aff was able to show how they reduce terrorism as well for other solves, poverty, agriculture, etc. The aff did amazing during cross ex, especially Chung. Neg was disorganized at times and said very lacking fluently. The aff had much more evidence.

~~Great Good! for~~

Agarwal spoke a little fast and unclearly.

Great job! Y'all will go far =)

PFD

FLIP: DG Heldt - Brimhall v. AX Brobst - Bedard

Public Forum Debate				Jonathan Garza			
Round 1				LL 274		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Heldt	4	16	1st	Bedard	2	19
2nd	Brimhall	3	17	2nd	Brobst	1	20
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)				Independent School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>							

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Use all of your time!
- Heldt, have more confidence when speaking.
- Summarize your points into ~~a few~~ your summary. The speech is not a time for line-by-line responses.
- The Rules say you can have solvency...

- Like the Roadmapping within your speech,
- Your first point is rather defensive, Restructure it?
- Bedard, Spend less time on framework in your summary so you don't get rushed. Also, weigh more in this speech
- Explain if servalence gear requires an expertise

RFD: I first look at the framework. Since the neg provides - Solvency that comes before the developmental aid, neg wins.

PFD

FLIP: CN Maitra - Gupta v. CP Saraf - Allen

Public Forum Debate				Matt Anderson (*CA)			
Round 1				LL 60		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Saraf	1	18	1st	Gupta	2	17
2nd	Allen	3	16	2nd	Maitra	4	15
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>				 Judge's Signature Red Mountain School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask them to leave + start debate.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

speaking critiques:

Affirmative:

- * Great execution
- * Better use of sources
- * Good use of examples


Negative

- * Need better execution
- * sometimes would say unsourced things (e.g. "they pulled out 3 years ago") in crossfire.

oral

PFD

FLIP: DT Panja - Nakos v. CA Nipper - Bogar

Public Forum Debate		Steven Bassett (*AG)	
Round 1		LL 106	Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
#2 Nakos			20/0
#4 Panja			1/18
Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
#1 Bogar			12/6 16
#3 Nipper			13
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature Student School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

0:46

Oral

Critique

Prep

1/28

1/28

PFD

FLIP: DC McClure - Martin v. CN Ramesh - Wang

Public Forum Debate				Alvin Chan (*DO)			
Round 1				SS 234		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Ramesh	1	18	1st	McClure	4	14
2nd	Wang	2	17	2nd	Martin	3	15
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____				 Judge's Signature Palo Verde High School School Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Art had more quantifiable impacts. Disclosed in detail in round.

PFD

FLIP: CN Su - Gilliam v. CH Poole - Brescia

Public Forum Debate				Tiffany Tibbetts (*FG)			
Round 1		SS 304		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM			
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Poole	3	16	1st	Su	1	20
2nd	Brescia	4	16	2nd	Gilliam	2	20
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)				GCA / FG School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>							

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Don't argue during cross fire.
 Poole - good questions during cross
 - added - you attacked your opponents
 case, but for your own case, all
 you did was restate rather than
 touch their arguments.
 Brescia - work on your "ums" and
 "likes". Focus your 1st rebuttal
 time on taking down your
 opponent's case. You only used
 2 of your 4 minutes. Use more
 prep @ the beginning if you
 need it.
 Have your partner deal w/ your evidence
 instead of you walking it over.

Su - good job not seeming pompous
 during cross.
 • Don't totally re-read your
 arguments in summary.
 Just briefly tell me it flows.

Gilliam - cut her off if she's
 not asking a question, which she
 was not.
 I also flowed that "more than 50%
 of the people will die" from
 their case.

Decision:

Pro did poor job attacking the other team's
 case.

Heylman- Ramprasad **PFD**

FLIP: CP Taylor - Heylman v. AC Lien - Srinivasan

Public Forum Debate				Craig Skelton (*DN)			
Round 1				LL 114		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Heylman		16	1st	Lien		15
2nd	Ramprasad		16	2nd	Srinivasan		15
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____				Craig Skelton Judge's Signature Marist School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both teams give overall analysis of the region but fail to give detailed examples of solvency for either method. There are no mechanisms discussed and DA/Mx is discussed in the abstract. There is a lack of either team addressing their side in the historical context of the Sahel.

Both teams should ask how the other method will solve.

Many assertions without evidence. What evidence is used, a general lack of analysis fails to link most to the round.

The round was close because neither team provided great impact analysis or analysis of clash. I was left to decide from many floating components that were not clearly tied together.

I vote for Pro because they come closest to demonstrating the D.A. Can positively impact the region.

PFD

FLIP: AD Ackerley - Chen v. DD Atkins - Atkins

Public Forum Debate				Matthew Brandstetter (*FO,DT)			
Round 1				COWDN 213		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	CHEN		25 15 mfr	1st	C. ATKINS		25 16 mfr
2nd	ACKERLEY		25 15 mfr	2nd	L. ATKINS		25 15 mfr
The winner of this debate was							
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒				M. Brandstetter			
(Circle Winner)				Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				FO			
				School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Small technical point: do not speak w/ pencils in your hands - gesturing w/ pencils is a bit distracting.

IA & IN: good speaking voices

Very congenial debate - thank both schools for pleasant, congenial tone.

RFD:

The debate comes down to whether development assistance has saved 25M lives - Aff evidence does not state this, only that assistance has been provided. Neg argues that assistance, even though given, is wasted. Howard study also states that underdevelopment is difficult, if not impossible, to reverse.

Δ Neg ballot.

BRIAN GAVLICK

DAVE, TAYLOR

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: FD Kumar - Surendra v. AG Thorley - Mouti

Public Forum Debate				Taylor Dave (*DZ) Brian Gavllick			
Round 1				LL 47		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Surendra	1	20	1st	Thorley	3	15
2nd	Kumar	2	19	2nd	Mouti	4	14
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)				Desat Vista HS			
Is this a low point win? No				School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Thorley-Mouti

Comments & Reason for Decision:

35 second

1st speaker ~~Surendra~~

I liked your calm method of speaking but at a few points you seemed unpolished. Careful w/ questions vs. statements in crossfire.

4th ~~3rd~~ speaker

Minor point- try to avoid ~~that~~ using 'you', use 'my opponent'. Try to use all parttime.

Nice, calm voice. Good CX answers.

Kumar Surendra & Kumar

30 second

2nd speaker

Clear, quick pace of speaking - great
Thanks for 3 KVI

3rd ~~4th~~ speaker

Clear, good pace. Informative
Good CX questions. Thanks for 3 KVI.

I questioned Pro's definition of military aid as purely offensive - surely defensive aid is also possible? Seems like Pro's C3 relies on military aid being used for offense.

Con shows that Quality of Life improves via military aid, but Pro shows that military aid can also be harmful. Pro also shows how developmental aid improves infrastructure, etc. thereby pulling out the roots of terrorism, poverty, etc. Since developmental aid is a long term solution, it must take priority.

I must vote Pro

Thank you to both sides for being calm and polite,

PFD

FLIP: DH Yang - Haider v. AS Freidman - Gummere

Public Forum Debate				Becky Andrade (*DC)			
Round 1				COWDN 215		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	George Yang	17	20	1st	Gummere, Ethan	17	17
2nd	Abbas Haider	19	20	2nd	Freidman, Rebecca	18	18
The winner of this debate was <u>Affirmative</u> Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____				Judge's Signature Becky Andrade School / Affiliation / Occupation Perry parent			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask them to leave to start debate.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~Decision~~

This decision was made because I felt the affirmative had a lot of cited works supporting their case.

+ + great preparation
+ lots of supporting doc.

- the introduction was a bit hard to follow

+ very easy to understand
+ I liked your pace

- soft power → hard power
statement unclear
- very few work cited to support argument

-7

17
81

17
19

Grandfather
Grandparent



This decision was made
because I felt the
affirmative had a lot
of solid work supporting
their case.

+ very easy to understand
+ I liked your paper

+ great preparation
+ lots of supporting case.

- self aware & had power
- statements unclear
- very few work cited to
- support argument

- the introduction was a
bit hard to follow

PFD

(A=P) (NEG)
 FLIP: DX Jung - Frehner v. DC Garrett - Andrade

Public Forum Debate				TK Berl (*CX)			
Round 1				LL 107		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	JUNG	4	17	1st	Garrett	3	17
2nd	FREHNER	2	17	2nd	Andrade	1	18
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature LAHS / PARSONS / CONTRACT OFFICER School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? _____							

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

COIN TOSS: AFFIRMATIVE JUNG / FREHNER 2nd > Garrett / ANDRADE

Comments & Reason for Decision:

All Excellent Speakers and obviously done a lot of research they all knew very well - Excellent!!

AFFIRMATIVE A LITTLE TOO FAST AND SLIGHTLY ABUSIVE IN QUESTIONING, A LOT OF GENERAL POINTS AND STATEMENTS WITHOUT SPECIFICS - A LOT OF GENERAL STATISTICS.

NEG - WELL DEVELOPED PRIORITY defense which is what this question addresses. Conceded points they "helped" AFF to disclose to zero in on defense of priority that military aid must come first along w/ dev. aid as a dev support to aid nations.

Excellent Both Sides !!


DAVENPORT, GABI

~~RASSETT~~
NICK
DAVIS

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DX Kirjwal - Aman v. DS Fedasiuk - Wakefield

Public Forum Debate				Gabi Davenport (*CC)			
Round 1				LL 149		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Kirjwal		18	1st	Fedasiuk Wakefield		18
2nd	Aman		19	2nd	Wakefield Fedasiuk		17
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature ASU School / Affiliation / Occupation			
(Circle Winner) Affirmative Negative Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>							

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Alg

peace keeping forces
conflict 250% GDP

liquid money increases instability
dev aid ineffective

military spending is 18% GDP -
less spending - increased instability

Reasons
better insight
empirics
lack of rebuttal

Aff

military Aid is bad
development and milit. not exclusive
milit aid increases violence

moral arg
infrastructure increases stab

ALEX PAPER
MEYER, PAM

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: CN Chew - Diyya v. AO Muddukrishna - Sharma

Public Forum Debate				Pam Meyer (*DH)			
Round 1				LL 270		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Diyya	4	26	1st	Muddukrishna	2	28
2nd	Chew	3	27	2nd	Sharma	1	29
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Harker / student School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? NO							

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD ON BACK

Comments:

Diyya: more eye contact, practice reading case more to nail fluency

Muddukrishna: Pace yourself, it is much more effectively to speak at a consistent rate, even if it is quick. Your speed bursts got muddled.

Chew: Try making less arguments and expanding on the arguments you do make instead. Bounced around too much, w/o enough specifics.

Sharma: Allocate your time more evenly, don't make an argument after buzzor, and definitely don't start one after. Solid rebuttal though.

Diyya: Way too soft spoken on this speech. The summary is supposed to sell me, you have to make the sale with eye contact, tone, and by giving me specific impact calc. that connects to resolution. Body language was poor.

Muddukrishna: Look up as often as possible, you can't just read faster and less clear b/c you're reading off a paper. Great argumentation on the link for how mil. assistance is NECESSARY for develop.

Chew: Make sure you are going for the BIG picture in this speech. Solid FF, but still need improvement w/ impact calc.

Sharma: More impact calc. and less actual argumentation in FF. Fill out my ballot for me. Still, great job all round. Needs stronger ENDING! The last 15 seconds should be nearly rehearsed.

RFD: From a flow perspective, the negative won by showing that military aid is a precursor for effective developmental assistance. In general, negative did superior job of impacting, using specific examples, and most importantly of providing arguments specifically unique to the resolution.

DENNIS KARTAJALA

AYEN, KEITH

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AG Kurtzman - Rowe v. CX Ahrens - Lathrop

Public Forum Debate				Keith Ayen (*CA)			
Round 1				LL 14		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Rowe	2	17	1st	Lathrop	3	16
2nd	Kurtzman	4	15	2nd	Ahrens	1	18
The winner of this debate was Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				Dennis D. Kartajala Judge's Signature Boris Flagstaff School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both sides had causation problems. E.g. How low we know success in Burkina Faso was due to development assistance rather than some more complex combination of history and culture? Also, claim that lack of education is root cause of terrorism, or that without military aid drugs will flow to Europe.

Con position gets slight edge on the ground that they stuck more closely to their strongest argument, namely, that "priority" refers to time and that economic and social development can occur only after order is established. I did not feel that the affirmatives fully met this argument.

The vagueness of the resolution provided opportunity for an argument neither side raised. Resolution does not say why dev. aid should be prioritized in Sahel. Therefore, spread to Latin America can be relevant or irrelevant, depending on the reason for prioritizing.

Both sides did an excellent job on an extremely difficult (because so vague) resolution.

PFD

FLIP: AS Mills - Mills v. CO Bryant - Riggs

Public Forum Debate				James Chung (*DH)			
Round 1				LL 10		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	David Mills	4	17	1st	Riggs	1	19
2nd	Mills	3	18	2nd	Bryant	2	18
The winner of this debate was Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>				Satheesh Aradhyula Judge's Signature CFHS, Tucson. School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- * These points by the 'Negative' team flowed through the rounds:
 - ✓ Development Assistance marginalizes women.
 - ✓ Can't give a blanket prescription that ~~one~~ development assistance is better than military assistance.
- * Affirmative team a reasonable case (although they did not take advantage of all the time given to them) but did not counter Negative's contentions. They allowed too many of Neg. team's points flow through with out resistance.
- * Affirmative team ~~argued~~ ^{did not show why} that dev. assistance is ~~over~~ should be prioritized over military assistance.

PFD

FLIP DC Jensen - Jernigan v. DX Ricksecker - Mandolang

Public Forum Debate				Jeffrey Kuperman (*AO)			
Round 1				LL 241		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Mandolang	3	17	1st	Jensen	2	18
2nd	Ricksecker	1	19	2nd	Jernigan	3	17
The winner of this debate was				<u>Affirmative</u> Negative (Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				 Judge's Signature <u>Carlsbad HS</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Structure
your 2nd speech
↑
Comments & Reason for Decision:

Mandolang: Try to speak a little clearer and maintain more eyecontact. Be more confident and assertive in crossfire.

Jensen: Slow down a little bit. This debate is about persuasion and that should be prioritized. ~~over~~ open

Ricksecker: Good eyecontact. Try to ~~be~~ follow the flow in order when refuting in your first speech.

Jernigan: More vocal inflection. Take hands out of pockets and use them.

WOODS, SCOTT

CHOTRAS, NEIKO

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: CA Kelly - Labban v. CS Thomas - Friend

Public Forum Debate				Scott Woods (*DH)			
Round 1				LL 230		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Crystal Labban		18	1st	Kyra Friend		18
2nd	Alyssa Kelly		19	2nd	KariJoy Thomas		18
The winner of this debate was							
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative				Nicholas Chotras			
(Circle Winner)				Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				ASU/ Horizon/ Student			
				School / Affiliation / Occupation			


Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Everyone did a great job of attacking their opponents' case and responding to the attacks made on their own, but the aff team was able to respond to mine & did a better job of supporting their arguments. They were really able to show the impacts of the round and why they were significant, and this made their case much stronger. You all did an excellent job!

PFD

FLIP: DT Jagadeesh - Thirumalai v. DH Kim - Soni


Public Forum Debate				Rose Vail (*CN)			
Round 1				LL 269		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank	Points	Speaker	Negative	Rank	Points
1st	Ashwath Thirumalai	(1-4) 1	(20-0) 20	1st	Jayden Soni	(1-4) 2	(20-0) 29
2nd	Suraj Jagadeesh	3	18	2nd	Eric Kim	4	17
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)				 Judge's Signature Hamilton School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>							

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision: *Resolved: Development Assistance should be prioritized over military aid in the Sahel region of Africa*

PFD

FLIP: AO Curtis - DeTaboada v. AF Seo - Lawrence

Public Forum Debate				Reyhan Kader (*DT)			
Round 1				LL 148		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Lawrence	1	18 18	1st	Curtis	4	20 16.5
2nd	Seo	3	17 17	2nd	DeTaboada	2	20 17.5
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature  The Harbor School School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>Yes</u>							

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Lawrence:

Dont case reading.

Okay, thanks for attempting to weigh things out terms like timeframe and magnitude but you do a terrible job at the weighing itself.

Seo:

read more cards and evidence

You dont have enough evidence to back up your arguments

Okay, you guys give the wrong timeframe analysis but again nice attempt

Curtis

Dont read a third argument when you literally have 10 seconds to explain it. Dude, your summary didn't touch about anything previously in the flow. Also give a roadmap
DeTaboada

You need to use more evidence in your case and rebuttal. All your stuff sounds nice theoretically, but it will help to read a card or two.

Give me a roadmap

RFD:

ORAL

This was a really hard round to judge and Curtis should have given the other way

CONNOR WOODRUFF
CRUZ, JUAN DE LA

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: CN Sethi - Chavda v. FK Niu - Nagarajan

Public Forum Debate				Juan De La Cruz (*CO)			
Round 1				LL 103		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Nagarajan	1	18	1st	Chavda	4	12
2nd	Niu	2	12	2nd	Sethi	3	12
The winner of this debate was				CNU			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)				Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? _____				School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg fails to show sufficient letters to make me discuss much of the affirmative
Chavda, who does not give me reason to accept the Aff. position. He better not use
specific evidence and does a good job of casting doubt on the aff's
Aff's Neg's scholarship.

A- maybe back off a little in crossfires. You were
a little dominating.

W- Don't let him control the questioning. You
asked a total of 2 questions.

W- summarize your opponents points, don't rebut
them.

PFD

FLIP: AG Blecker - Blecker v. DH Mitina - Chung

Public Forum Debate				Martin Lawrence (*DT)			
Round 1				LL 150		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Blecker D		17	1st	Mitina		18
2nd	Blecker A		19	2nd	Chung		17
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				 Judge's Signature <u>Harker</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

CX 1

kinda lack luster.
Both teams need to know
cases better.

CX 2

Need to have
? ready

oral
X

12411E
GUY, JOEL

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DF Ong - Silva v. AD Bai - Donovan

Public Forum Debate				Joel Guy (*AC)			
Round 1				LL 275		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Vincent Bai	4	15	1st	Kim Ong	2	19
2nd	Liam Donovan	3	17	2nd	Ben Silva	1	20
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature ASU School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒							
(Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>							

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- As a team try to become a little more clear on your definitions especially developmental assistance.
- Also try to claim that protection needs to be done through the local police - but who is training these forces?
- Finally who is funding this USFG? NATO? Etc.

NEG.

- Should have taken CX answers (like def. clarification) and questioned inconsistency.

PFD

FLIP: FK Conklin - Dong v. CN Guo - Sadler

Public Forum Debate				Mitchell Dyer (*DF)			
Round 1				LL 243		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Sadler		30 20	1st	Conklin		24 19
2nd	Guo		30 20	2nd	Dong		24 19
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)				Bid Round Briefs / Mesquite School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>							

-1:30

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff
 structure your case better. Sub-sub-points are a little excessive and you start lists that you don't finish. You should ask for their evidence more often

Neg
 I think running "dev. bad" isn't wise against their case. You're better off going for military good b/c the aff just spikes out of it so easily. I think your rebuttal should have had more line-by-line. The aff case looks so clean compared to your own.

RFD: The rules of PFD allow for general advocacies, which I think legitimizes that lock you into a position where you don't really win any offense, especially because the aff doesn't have to support SAPs, etc. As a result I look most importantly to neg's first contention. The Collier evidence concludes that growth is more important to preventing conflict than anything else because a strong infrastructure is important. I think supporting countries in the short term is also important to maintain longterm stability. There isn't a lot of risk analysis being done. From my point of view the affirmative is most likely to prevent these issues, especially given the imminent paradigm shift towards supporting workers, so I affirm.

PFD

FLIP: DT Bopardikar - Misra v. AD Rubin - Irfan

Public Forum Debate				Lisa Lincoln (*FC)			
Round 1				LL 240		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	S. Irfan		18	1st	N. Bopardikar		19
2nd	L. Rubin		15	2nd	A. Misra		19
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)				 Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>				Desert Academy School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro Team - work together more, seemed to be two sole operators. Sameed said in cross that you'd bring up evidence Levi - but you didn't.
 - sameed, you come off as smug, watch that
 - Levi -> take charge in crossfire, you let opponent argu his point in his own question. Get more clash.

Neg Team - Good case but could really use definitions or framework. Good evidence. could work on stronger impacts. There's nowhere that it says impacts need to be saheel specific (are you creating a framework?). You told me all reasons you should win, tell me what you dropped of theirs instead.

Decision:
 Both sides dropped points by the end. This is a complex case and you could use framework to help argue points and hold up some of your assumptions because the interp. of resolution is subjective.
 I'm giving this case to neg because they had more evidence. Pro needs more evidence and if you say, "it's just logical" off, that doesn't work in PF.
 Great debate both teams.

PFD

FLIP: DT Xie - Bashar v. CP Waters - Elzarka

Public Forum Debate				Elizabeth McConaghey (*DH)			
Round 1				LL 145		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank	Points	Speaker	Negative	Rank	Points
1st	<u>Zabin Bashar</u>	(1-4) <u>(2)</u>	(20-0) <u>18</u>	1st	<u>Amy Elzarka</u>	(1-4) <u>(3)</u>	(20-0) <u>17</u>
2nd	<u>Stanley Xie</u>	<u>(4)</u>	<u>16</u>	2nd	<u>Anna Waters</u>	<u>(1)</u>	<u>20</u>
The winner of this debate was				Elizabeth McConaghey Judge's Signature BASIS Scottsdale, Director School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative <u>Negative</u>							
(Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>							

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirmative argument started strong w/ excellent, + logical points clearly organized by Zabin B.

- he cites several health factors, agricultural aid
- ↑ in resource leads to ↓ need for terrorism

Amy Elzarka opened with many strong statements but not as much supporting evidence. It was there - but not in the abundance of the initial affirmative. Main points:

- military aid needed to resolve ethnic wars
- cited UN/French peace keeping successes

Momentum swung in the first crossfire. Amy ~~was~~ asked many questions seeking clarity on Zabin's arguments, but most responses were "we'll cover that" and there appeared to be less knowledge ~~over~~ on the speaker of his evidence.

A large question was raised as to whether S. Sudan should be ^{considered}

Stanley then presented a strong case for devel. aid:

- Dev. aid will solve stability issues
- continued to press S. Sudan's exclusion from the region
- " "
- " "

- Raised an odd point about peacekeepers adding to violence

Anna Waters presentation was exceptionally strong + logical

- defined key terms, used evidence to claim ~~that~~ military aid is necessary to quell terrorism before using dev. aid
- argued strong religious beliefs to counter family planning in the region

Recited OECD's inclusion of S. Sudan →

2nd Crossfire between Stanley + Anna clearly went in ~~the~~ the Neg's favor. She questioned the sustainability of dev aid in the LT and questioned his evidence of peace keeping crimes. There was not a very succinct or confident or evidence based response to her questions.

The Summary rounds were similar to Round 1: both Zabin + Amy were strong + knowledgeable. The following points were carried through:

- vaccines
 - FMK
 - violence is a product of dev. needs
 - only pockets of violence
 - education $\rightarrow$ $\downarrow$ terror attacks
- Zabin

- Amy
- rebuttal
The peacekeeper concern + terror claims as not specific to the region
 - military aid solves for the LT
 - reaffirmed Sudan is in the region.

Grand Crossfire

- more of an interrogation by the Neg to Aff.

Final Points

- DOD analysts
 - Asnaultine
 - Vaccine
 - Opportunities
- Aff

- Neg
- DOD analysts confirm all over the region.
 - we have not reached completion, Dependence, Brokers, Analysis, France, Ruande

In conclusion,

most convincing, logical, + succinct arguments by Neg. They had good responses for all questions posed to them + were able to poke several holes in the Aff's arguments.

GABRIEL MILLER

KUO, PHOEBE

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DO Baduria - Spada v. DT Sahoo - Papakipos

Public Forum Debate				Phoebe Kuo			
Round 1				LL 273		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
2nd	Spada		20/17	1st	Papakipos		20/18
4th	Baduria		20/19	2nd	Sahoo		20/17
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				Judge's Signature Gabriel Miller Chaparral HS School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Oral critique given

- Affirmative provided clear quantifiable impacts showing how lives are saved by developmental assistance health care and agriculture ~~assistance~~ assistance. ~~showed~~ Demonstrated that poverty, low quality of life, and lack of resources is root cause of violence, terror, and instability.
- Neg ~~needs to~~ make more analysis and provide impacts that can be weighed. Neg also dropped many of their own impacts.
- Affirmative did best job of weighing impacts at the end of round.

Great round overall!

PFD

FLIP: AX Thakar - Saha v. FC Kelehan - Miller

Public Forum Debate				Katherine Lagiglia (*CN)			
Round 1				LL 221		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Saha	1	19	1st	Kelehan	3	17
2nd	Thakar	4	17	2nd	Miller	2	17
The winner of this debate was				K La Signer Judge's Signature			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)				 School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>							

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Saha gesturing so frequent
loses effectiveness
great enthusiasm but
1st Cross used to
justify? w/ few questions
@ haven't effective/?

Shows adapting to
opp. & able to quickly form
argument

Thakar

Very good addressing
the opp's arguments

Quick on feet

Waban volume a bit
loud when at some

pts then too low & trail off @ end @ FINISH STRONG even
if time up

Kelehan Summary pace was very good
good clear argument

did you repeat
"are going to corrupt?"

[87% dinged on]
good job think you
had harder job prov
military over develop

Good don't allow
him to run over
? wouldn't you agree...
Miller seems to open you up
for shut down

BEST PACE! :)

? - project ? ding

Very clear persuasive
argument

SAHH

Developmental
aid bt military

- EMPOWERING women
- Lessens STDS
- terrorism less

a bit
toward
Population ? - final
X

women
argue in
final
climate chg

Kelahan

Military 1st

food & water

repeat?
OR
citing?
without stabilizing
wrong hands
stabilize 1st

military aid ?
same

probeneal

TARISM

Stipulating
that
this most
important
education
1 climate chg
2 over population

PRIORITIZE

Miller

climate
chg.

greatest benefit

Stabilizing 1st

Great finish!

HUNCA
TARISM

debt refuse
Contraception?

overpop.

women's

NOT SURE
MILITARY is
BEST way to
empower women!

Final
argument
no need
to summarize
at top
again!

Public Forum Debate				Wade Jernigan (*DC)			
Round 1				LL 271		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Jones		17	1st	Nguyen		18
2nd	Turner		19	2nd	Schulman		19
The winner of this debate was							
Affirmative		Negative		Angela Buzan			
(Circle Winner)				Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win?		No		Perry HS			
				School / Affiliation / Occupation			

20 sec
1 min

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Jones (A)
D-prioritized. OK. What about "over 5 million children" 11 million deaths
① Quality of life
• environment
• 58 million, mostly farmers
• 80% soil degraded
• Health make this a contention
• 16 m. starving, #5
• AIDS/HIV
② Development & Security (@ 1 min)
- Security can't be resolved
- terrorism
- develop this contention

Nguyen (A)
0- observation
① D.A. fails → drives out farmers
Military works
Gmu: Govt corruption
Aid caseloads tripled, increasing
② Military necessary
Thousands miles, dangerous terrain
• stability
• Experience for troops [interesting not ethical?]
• Terrorism
military transport [good]
all out aid
Excellence A speech Nguyen!

Turner (Excellent speech)
Framework: yes they can coexist but the resolve itself suggests one is more important.
Region of failure? ok good
How can you prove military = better?
Use the call for IMPACT CALCULUS
Violence as Survival. - Develop w/ a warrant

Schulman (B)
Health assistance not characterized as developmental aid.
Terrorism violent, aid → govt & increases terrorism
Re: Food
humanitarian is aid & action

Great eye contact.
Excellent performance.
Aff- Death is sad. Yes, but Africa's 1.1 Billion pop will double in 40 years. USE THIS!

Beautiful cases.
Professional demeanor.
Con wins on impacts and flawed points.
Aff- Contention 2 is inconsistent & underdeveloped.

Jones - print your cards. Otherwise the team has your computer as long as they need it.

~~ROBERTS~~ Andreatos, Kristin
YANG, ROGER

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AO Sheets - DeSantis v. AA Shen - Ziaee

Public Forum Debate				Roger Yang (*DH)			
Round 1				LL 264		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Ziaee		18	1st	Sheets		17
2nd	Shen		20	2nd	DeSantis		19
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)				 Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				<u>Chaparral/teacher</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Ziaee: good specific examples
allow other team to speak during cross

Shen: great speaker - very clear and also covered tons of info
good job in cross - asking for examples

*weakest pt - ↑ democracy - try to get more specific s

Sheets: beginning of 1st speech - a little confusing

DeSantis: best summary of humanitarian vs. developmental

* use of military to deliver aid is very strong pts
* corruption issue was weakest point - got stronger w/ DeSantis Final Focus

PFD

FLIP: DZ Warburton - Wong v. DD Karbo - Dupree

Public Forum Debate				Matt Mayhood (*CH)			
Round 1				LL 262		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Dupree	4	15	1st	Warburton	3	19
2nd	Karbo	1	20	2nd	Wong	2	20
The winner of this debate was							
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)				 Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? <u>Yes</u>				<u>Foot Hill High School</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The neg's frame was stated that who ever solves for stability wins the round. Their point about maller being in niger gave stability but when they pulled out niger fell and is now full of terrorists. Stability is resilience to change they ~~arg~~ (higher) wasn't very resilient, so military aid couldn't have been that beneficial. The aff kind of touched on this but mainly focused the debate on the definition of priority.

~~AKA DANIEL~~

HOSSEINI, LEILA

ERIK FURBOE

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AX Akella - Garg v. CC Knight - Shafstall

Public Forum Debate				Leila Hosseini (*AG)			
Round 1				LL 108		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Garg	1	19	1st	Knight	4	16
2nd	Akella	2	18	2nd	Shafstall	3	17
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative							
(Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? NO				ASU School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

CON

PRO

- Prioritize - developmental vs. over developmental
- less costly
- Terror
- Military necessary
- Prioritize aid → Develop. incentive
- Developmental aid → less stability
- Islamic Ext low
- Cloud seeding expensive
- Military intervention
- Military aid not effective → Prioritize aid

- Development assist → Moral
- Military bad
- Disease
- Cloud seeding
- Prioritize → Military obligation
- fulfill duty
- Islamic groups → no threat
- Disease → self sustaining
- Military + training
- Impact long
- Lives → outweigh magnitude, moral obligation
- Terror - Turn
- Develop solves

RFD: Pro gives better reasoning as to why developmental aid should be prioritized as CON simply restates contentions w/o further explaining w/ analyses. CON fails to explain why military is better than developmental assistance. Disease throughout region, outweighs conflict.

PFD

FLIP: CN Rudrapatna - Phan v. DK Ramos - Bathla

Public Forum Debate				Jonathan MacMillan (*AA)			
Round 1				LL 105		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Ramos		#8	1st	Rudrapatna		#7
2nd	Bathla		#6	2nd	Phan		#5
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Dougherty Valley HS Coach/Teacher School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? No							

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision: Aff definition was preferred. Neg definition leads to certain deaths and suffering (civil war/coups), while Neg provided no examples of human rights abuses.

Ramos

Rudrapatna

Bathla

Phan

- MA - Aid to assist country countries over territory
- a. Many victims need help (hunger)
 - b. Develop. Assist is only way to help
 - c. Ending drought and conflicts
- II. Infrastructure & Stability

- Value - Security of gov inst.
- MA - weapons or trading
- a. Formation of Gov depends on M.A.
 - b. Stability of gov relies on aid
 - c. w/o proper aid, assistance doesn't take place
- Need gov't to implement that's trustworthy
- a. Starvation & displacement
 - b. Climate Change
 - c. MA is key to aiding victims of climate Δ

- This is not MA
- ~~MA as a ~~definition~~~~ using Aff def.
- Mali is example of MA failing
- concede
- concede
- MA cannot help to stop drought but DA helps to deal with droughts impacts

- Neg def is preferred because it doesn't say Gov must be supported
- II. sub c
 - MA reduces risk of war
 - peacekeepers
 - considered MA under neg def.
- IIc → MA mitigates impacts of clim Δ

- Definition is better because it is more broad & does not allow for opposition support
- Peacekeepers = D.A.
- Funding opposition groups leads to civil war

- Leaving dictatorships alone leads to more human rights violations

Voters

- Definition of MA
- Neg definition leads to civil war or coup
- Infrastructure is needed in Saheli

Voters

- Definition of MA
- Aff definition feels corrupt gov
- Subpoint C unrefuted
- DA can't exist w/o MA

Pham know your definitions and how to explain that pencekeepers are considered M.A.

Rudra... - No ~~specific~~ specific examples of dictators causing human rights abuses

PFD

FLIP: FO Palmer - Kim v. DF Goulet - Bua

Public Forum Debate				Mahir Qureshi (*FD)			
Round 1				COWDN 203		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Kim		19	1st	Bua		18
2nd	Palmer		20	2nd	Goulet		19
The winner of this debate was				Judge's Signature			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)				Basis Chandler			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff.

Kim
• a little fast
• great speaker

Palmer
• speaking is impressive

- party is the root of terrorism
- 95% attacks on military

1. Euro. Commission,
 - future crisis
 - agriculture
 - food
 - farmer income
 - 12 times the amount
 - more crops can be produced
 - less unemployment
 - lower mortality rates
 - 180,000 tons of food
2. Terrorism
 - 39% less terrorism?
 - military causes terrorism
 - prioritize

Developing nation
- lack of education

war on terror

Neg.

1. military
 - subcommittee - military is most important
 - stronger security force
 2. Sahel is defenseless
 - lack of stability / security
 - AQIM
 - lack of social progress
 3. July 2013, AQIM will get
 - integrated assistance strong
- Future
- external military
 - security in Sahel is vital
 - Healthcare is prevented by terrorism

- AQIM military influx of fighters

endence?

2:00
-30
1:30

PFD

neg aff
FLIP: DH Cohen - Kovalchuk v. AH McGraw - Baca

Public Forum Debate				Desiree Srinivas (*CN)			
Round 1				LL 2		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	McGraw	2	14	1st	Kovalchuk	4	9
2nd	Baca	3	11	2nd	Cohen	1	15
				25 24			
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)				 Hamilton School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>							

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th


Comments & Reason for Decision:

At First, both teams spoke fast & it was hard to decipher their main points. However, one speaker on each team stood out. The winners were chosen because the team had a stronger argument from both partners. — points overall determined winner of debate

4:15
4:04
3:00
4:00
3:55
3:07
1:53
2:00
-2:05
1:42

PFD

FLIP: CN Guo - Sun v. CP Elzarka - Gutala

Public Forum Debate				Julian Crown (*FK)			
Round 1				COWDN 218			
				Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM			
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Gutala	16	26	1st	Sun	16	26
2nd	Elzarka	16	26	2nd	Guo	16	26
The winner of this debate was							
Affirmative Negative				 Judge's Signature			
(Circle Winner)				Leland / Coach			
Is this a low point win? _____				School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

A lot of the FGM stuff (investments in the 2nd half.) seem untopical (is investing in reproductive health "development"? You might clarify this to avoid ambiguity; not that it's a big deal.

~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~
 I'm confused by the APP AZ security w/ respect to Mali.

Case is a little bit confusing organizationally

Where is the evidence that militants are in control of these regions & preventing DA delivery?

France did NOT remove troops b/c of a coup ~~...~~ Please don't assert that

Where did the 2004 ~~thing~~ come from?

~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

PFD

FLIP: AK Russell - Ferguson v. AG Artigue - Ramaswamy

Public Forum Debate				Brandon Garrett (*CP)			
Round 1				LL 45		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Kara Ferguson	16.5	26.5	1st	Anita Ramaswamy	18.5	28.5
2nd	Jake Russell	17	27	2nd	Heidi Artigue	18	28
The winner of this debate was Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				 Judge's Signature Presentation High School School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Given on round

PFD

FLIP: FG Nobby - Dowell v. DH Lee - Lee

Public Forum Debate				Darius Ansari (*AG)			
Round 1				LL 272		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Haley Lee		20	1st	Patrick Nobby		15
2nd	Stanley Lee		20	2nd	Julia Dowell		15
The winner of this debate was <u>Affirmative</u> Negative (Circle Winner)				 Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>				<u>Independent</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Extensive oral critiques provided, I keep my flows so feel free to email me any ^{former} questions regarding the round. I can be reached at abuys@colgate.edu

Otherwise Pro won main impacts of stability & quality of life

PFD

FLIP: DH Meyer - Sikora v. DN Torpy - Apple

Public Forum Debate				Arthur Chandra (*DX)			
Round 1				LL 113		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Sikora		13	1st	Torpy		18
2nd	Meyer		17	2nd	Apple		16
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>yes</u>				 Judge's Signature Redlands HS School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Conceded Green @ End.

P2 PFD C1
FLIP: DT Huang - Chona v. AD Relich - Aradhyula

Public Forum Debate				Joel Underwood (*DD)			
Round 1				LL 248		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Huang	3	18	1st	Aradhyula	1	20
2nd	Chona	4	17	2nd	Relich	2	19
DT: Huang / Chona				AD: Relich / Aradhyula			
The winner of this debate was				Judge's Signature			
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)				J. Underwood DD			
Is this a low point win? ☐				School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask th

Comments & Reason for Decision: JUnderwood@seattlecademy.org (Flow emailed upon request)


Pro was basically doing Policy. Fast with 'cards', 'impacts', 'solves', etc. Careful. Adopted really well in the first couple speeches. Less so in the second half. Don't feel like you have to get every factoid covered. Take the aggression on XF down just a notch.

Con: REALLY smooth speakers. Careful about simply dismounting aid based on supply/demand. You're asking me to buy that locals would actually prefer a better price for their textiles over malaria deaths!

I have to go CON due to PRO barely touching on MI. Spent lots of time telling me DA is good. Priority

PFD

FLIP: CC Hunt - DeNicola v. DX Lim - Tang

Public Forum Debate				Alex Ackroyd (*CP)			
Round 1				LL 268		Fri 01/10/14 10:30AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Daniel Tang	3	17 17	1st	Destiny DeNicola	2	17 17
2nd	David Lim	4	17 17	2nd	Holden Hunt	1	18 18
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
Affirmative <u>Negative</u> (Circle Winner)				Presentation HS. School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>							

Some of these rooms were used by Policy this morning, the minute they are finished with the debate (not the critique) ask them to leave so you can start debate

Comments & Reason for Decision: