

(4)

(3)

JUN, SEO YOUNG

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AC Lien - Srinivasan v. DT Panja - Nakos

(4)

(3)

(2)

(3)

(2)

Public Forum Debate				Seo Young Jun (*CN)			
Round 2				SS 234		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Nakos, Sebi	2	19	1st	Elliot Lien	3	16
2nd	Panja, Maneesha	2	16	2nd	Sneha Srinivasan	3	16
The winner of this debate was				Seo Young Jun			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)				HHG			
Is this a low point win? ☒ No				School / Affiliation / Occupation			


DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- ~~Pro~~ ~~Con~~ Africa
- long-lasting effect
 - Agriculture
 - Sustainability - Neg needs reason to why risk lives
 - Provided 10 yrs of military aid, not working in practice
 - Big picture vs Specific
 - ~~Military aid betters~~
 - No Western influence
- PRO**
- Increase in terrorism
 - mil aid is not the only way to stability
- Affirmative - very strong points, nailed every single point from Neg to do rebuttal
- military aid must be priority
 - Security, w/o it, no development
 - lack military abilities
 - Immediate concerns
 - Agriculture ^{aid} hurts in the long run
 - Don't receive developmental aid - more flourishing
 - Educating women
 - Overpopulation
 - Solve these problems now
 - ~~Developmental aid~~
 - ~~Developmental aid~~
 - Western influence ~ global
 - Hurting the economy in the long run
- CON**
- Neg Negative - could have benefited from using full time to state all the points
- Lacked concluding some of the points stated

PFD

FLIP: DH Lee - Lee v. CN Bhatti - Ramadoss

Public Forum Debate				Steven Bassett (*AG)			
Round 2				SS 304		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
#1	Ramadoss		17	#2	Lee, Haley		18
#3	Bhatti		17	#4	Lee, Stanley		18
The winner of this debate was Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)				 Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? _____				Student School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Prep: ~~then~~

Prep:

~~then~~

1:00

1:00

Oral

Critique

Neg: Streamline
Voters


Ev.?

RFD

Calling out the
dichotomy as false

PFD

FLIP: DZ Warburton - Wong v. CP Khelghati - Mobarhan

Public Forum Debate				TK Berl (*CX)			
Round 2				LL 221		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank	Points	Speaker	Negative	Rank	Points
1st	Cole Warburton (2) (1-4)	(1-4)	(20-0)	1st	Mariush Mobarhan (4) (1-4)	(1-4)	(20-0)
2nd	Jacob Wong (3) (1-4)	(1-4)	(20-0)	2nd	Talla Khelghati (1) (1-4)	(1-4)	(20-0)
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)				LAHS / PARENT / CONTRACTOR School / Affiliation / Occupation OFFICER			
Is this a low point win? <u>MS</u>							

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

INTERESTING ROUND DIFFICULT TO JUDGE AS IT SEEMED AFF WAS ARGUING NEG & VICE/VERSA!! A LOT OF REGRATATION OF FACTS READ ON BOTH SIDES WITHOUT CLEAR DEVELOPMENT OF CASE AFF OR NEG.

AFF - STRUCTURE OF CASE WEAKLY DEVELOPED WITHOUT SPECIFIC EXAMPLES OF WHY AFFIRMATIVE IS NEG FOR DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE, TOO MANY NEGATIVE MILITARY EXAMPLES DO NOT MAKE AFFIRMATIVE CASE?!


NEG - GOOD NARRATIVE OF PRIORITY, & SPECIFIC EXAMPLES OF WHY Military ~~Should~~ ^{Should} be priority but weak initial case.

Both teams dropped contentions - Neg dropped whole Section.

The framework for both sides needs further development and outline the AFF or NEG side more clearly?

PFD

FLIP: DA Almanza - Raso v. AG Thorley - Mouti

Public Forum Debate				Taylor Chen (*AD)			
Round 2				LL 275		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Mouti	4	16	1st	Almanza	3	17
2nd	Thorley	1	18	2nd	Raso	2	18
The winner of this debate was Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____				 Judge's Signature  School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Thorley → Calm, clear delivery.

Mouti → Spoke softly, difficult to hear at times

Almanza → More eye contact, spoke quick, difficult to understand at times

Raso → Spoke with conviction, clear, believable.

Overall, negative was more convincing even though do not agree that developmental aid equates to imperialism.

PFD

FLIP: DT Duraiswamy - Misra v. FK Gilbert - Gowda

Public Forum Debate				Chanise McClure (*AK)			
Round 2				LL 241		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Misra	3	11	1st	Gilbert	2	20
2nd	Duraiswamy	4	19	2nd	Gowda	1	20
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>Yes</u>				 Judge's Signature Bingham High School School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I vote aff because they ^{that} give me AIDS impacts ~~because~~ thousands of peoples lives are being saved. They prove terrorism & with M.A. ^{show} Peace keeping has failed empirically.

PFD

FLIP: DC Jensen - Jernigan v. CP Ramprasad - Heylman

Public Forum Debate				Dennis Karjala (*CS)			
Round 2				LL 113		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	HEYLMAN	3	14	1st	JENSEN	2	15
2nd	RAMPRASAD	4	13	2nd	JERNIGAN	1	16
The winner of this debate was Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				Dennis S. Karjala Judge's Signature BASIS Flagstaff School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both sides did well with difficult resolutions. Both could do better detailing a closer causal relationship between past actions (devel. aid here, military aid there) and claimed result.

Con did a better job sticking with the resolution that security is needed now whereas Pro was not as convincing that security could be achieved via long-term eradication of ~~po~~ poverty, etc.

VAIL, Rose
CRUZ, JUAN DE LA

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: CH Henriott - Wilde v. AO Curtis - DeTaboada

Public Forum Debate				Juan De La Cruz (*CO)			
Round 2				LL 13		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank	Points	Speaker	Negative	Rank	Points
1st	Dominic Henriott	2	18	1st	Dylan Curtis	1	20
2nd	Thomas Wilde	4	17	2nd	Fey DeTaboada	3	19
The winner of this debate was				Judge's Signature			
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒				Hamilton			
(Circle Winner)				School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>							

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff: ignored logic, misquoted premis.

Neg: Militar to be security for dev aid,
not instead of dev, but 1st for protection.

PFD

FLIP: DS Carlton - Schieke v. CA Nipper - Bogar

Public Forum Debate				Robert lebeda (*DZ)			
Round 2				LL 12		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Bogar		16.5	1st	Schieke		18.5 19
2nd	Nipper		17	2nd	Carlton		19.5
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Chamade Speech Coach School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? _____							

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The Neg won this round because they showed how military is more needed before development. The aff talked a bit about education, but Neg showed how security was more necessary. The aff seem less confident and drop most of the aff case and focused too much on points that ultimately wouldn't help them win the round.

Great job!! Great round! =)

CHUNG, JAMES

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AD Relich - Aradhyula v. AK Faulao - Vendemiatti


Public Forum Debate				James Chung (*DH)			
Round 2				COOR L1-88		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Vendemiatti	2	19	1st	Aradhyula	1	20
2nd	Faulao	4	19	2nd	Relich	2	19
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>				<i>Jeffrey Kuperman</i> Judge's Signature <i>Carlsbad HS</i> School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PFD

FLIP: DX Jung - Frehner v. AD Rubin - Irfan

Public Forum Debate				Katherine Rolfe (*CN)			
Round 2				LL 273		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Jay Jung		16.5	1st	Sameed Irfan	1	19
2nd	George Frehner		18.0	2nd	Levi Rubin		15.5
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)				Chaparral - student School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? Tie							

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I voted for the Aff b/c they were better able to provide offense towards why deo and is good - especially towards quality of life. Neg needed more offense on why mil and is good - also lacked solid evidence w/ numbers. - Oral critique.

PFD

FLIP: CS Thomas - Friend v. CP Jagadish - Sridhar

Public Forum Debate				Ryan Newman (*CH)			
Round 2				LL 106		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Thomas	4	15	1st	Jagadish	1	19
2nd	Friend	3	17	2nd	Sridhar	2	16
The winner of this debate was							
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒				 Judge's Signature			
(Circle Winner)				Foot hill High school School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>							

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The Affirmative's ideology behind using military aid with developmental aid as the priority is a great way to look at it and word it, but negative had substantial amounts of evidence showing ways in which military aid alone is more than enough to provide stability for the developmental aid to be useful. The aff had examples of their scenario working as a joint operation. The aff team got flustered and seemed to be at a loss of words at times but did very well to hold their own against much more experienced forensicators. You can only get better by learning from those who are better than you. by far the best novice team I've judged

HUSSAIN, SYED
ANDRADE, BECKY

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AO Sheets - DeSantis v. DX Lim - Tang

Public Forum Debate				Syed Hussain (*DH)			
Round 2				LL 108		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Sarah Sheets		19	1st	Daniel Tang		17
2nd	J. DeSantis		19	2nd	David Lim		17
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____				B. Andrade Judge's Signature Rury parents School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

You did attack ~~up~~ negs. contention well.

Great speakers - both of you.

Your contentions were strong and varied.

Very articulate and professional.

Contention 1 & 2 too similar
never developed contention 3

There was very little supporting documentation.

The topic turned to over knowing governments - be careful.

You stated we would be crazy to give governments military (stuff) that would be used against us - that has happened before.

great speaking voices
tempo, eye contact

WILLIAM, 2000.


71
71

gent. lund
mild bond

91
91

sharp 2000
of 2000

black. 2
sharp 2000



got 2. 31 notations
notations

never double notations

notations with new and
notations.

notations of new
notations of new
notations.

notations of new
notations of new
notations of new
notations of new
notations of new

notations of new
notations of new
notations of new

notations of new
notations of new
notations of new

notations of new
notations of new
notations of new

notations of new
notations of new
notations of new

GUY, JOEL Broderick Krager

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: CX Ahrens - Lathrop v. DG Heldt - Brimhall

Public Forum Debate				Joel Guy (*AC)			
Round 2				LL 270		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Lathrop	2	16	1st	Heldt	3	15
2nd	Ahrens	1	18	2nd	Brimhall	4	14
The winner of this debate was				Brimhall			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative				Judge's Signature			
(Circle Winner)				Sunnyslope			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Heldt - work on reading more smoothly. In crossfire, you ask good questions, but you don't use them to their advantage. Keep asking them to elaborate and then ask for proof. They probably won't have any. Also, work with your partner better. You don't seem dynamic. Good point that we can't control corrupt govt.

Lathrop - your case NEEDS more links. Give a source that tells me why providing infrastructure leads to less terror. Great job in crossfire! Thank you for finally providing the Libya evidence that developmental aid actually works.

Brimhall - you're just elaborating on your case. Please, it's called a rebuttal because you rebut your opponent's case. You are wasting valuable attack time. I don't think the equalizing strategy is working because you aren't proving how this plan is the best one. And you can't then fall back on military aid.

Ahrens - thank you for calling sources! Equalization is an okay thing for con to do, but they aren't doing it right. Attack their links, not their strategy. Great rebuttal, bringing up new states on actual abuse happening in military aid regions.

REFF - terror - Pro makes a good point that we don't know who were giving money to.

- social development - Neither team provided good enough evidence
- effectiveness - Con couldn't provide examples of military aid working, Pro had several

Connor Woodruff
MARTIN, ALYSSA

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AO Muddukrishna - Sharma v. AX Brobst - Bedard

Public Forum Debate				Alyssa Martin			
Round 2				COWDN 215		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	<i>Bedard</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>18.75</i>	1st	<i>Muddukrishna 3</i>	<i>18.25</i>	<i>18.5</i>
2nd	<i>Brobst</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>18.75</i>	2nd	<i>Sharma</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>18.9</i>
The winner of this debate was							
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒				<i>CMU</i> Judge's Signature			
(Circle Winner)				<i>ASH</i> School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? _____							

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The Affirmative failed to effectively respond to the negative claims. The negative was a prerequisite to development. Given the time is very little the Affirmative can gain from the negative does not show better than. The affirmative better shows ability to not change the facts.

No specific speaker notes were not given orally.

PFD

FLIP: CN Ngo - Agarwal v. AD Ackerley - Chen

Public Forum Debate				Brandon Garrett (*CP)			
Round 2				LL 269		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	<u>Chen</u>		<u>16</u>	1st	<u>Agarwal</u>		<u>15</u>
2nd	<u>Ackerley</u>		<u>17</u>	2nd	<u>Ngo.</u>		<u>16</u>
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)				 Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? <u>no yes</u>				<u>Presentation HS</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

don't fight w/ your partner
stop talking over your
partner.

In Round

PFD

FLIP: DH Cohen - Kovalchuk v. DX Kirjwal - Aman

Public Forum Debate				Alex Daniel (*DT,AC)			
Round 2				LL 107		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Kirjwal	4	17.5	1st	Kovalchuk	3	17.5
2nd	Aman	2	18	2nd	Cohen	1	14.5
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Harker School School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? ☒ NO							

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Kirjwal: Good case, I like the #1's and so will lots of other judges. Slow down and emphasize #1's though, slow down for less experienced judges, approp. for me.

Kovalchuk: Solid case, but the contention is risky for any case even w/ three sub-p's. Diversify your case to stop other team from harping

Aman: Good style, but 4, 5, 6 were all the same. If you have "11 responses" or 12, or 13, or even 15, they have to all be different and response, not just 11 things you have to say.

Cohen: Great rebuttal. Spend more than 20 seconds breaking down contention. Solid, unique, and effective responses made this speech special. Be more clear when rebutting their rebuttal.

Kirjwal: Needs much much better impact calc. This was just a continuation of rebuttal, not a summary.

Kovalchuk: I need specific reasons I should vote for you. Good job summarizing arguments, but finish the job.

Aman: "we need to use our logic" ← NO don't use
 Almost zero substance in first minute of speech.
 You're a great speaker, work on impacting and providing specific reasoning as to why you won an argument that should seal my ballot.

Cohen: slow down a little for other judges.
 Great round for you. You won the ballot.

↓ Neg
RFD: Shows that true and long-term econ growth can only occur if the gov't in the country is stable, and that mili aid is necessary for this. Ultimately, ~~it~~ was unable to rebut the notion that dev. assistance was part of a viciously repetitive cycle that created artificial and unsustainable progress while mili. aid could actually create long-term benefits INCLUDING more effective developmental assistance.

PFD

FLIP: CC Knight - Shafstall v. DZ Tennakoon - Grewal

Public Forum Debate				Elizabeth McConaghey (*DH)			
Round 2				SS 314		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Dhishal Tennakoon	②	19	1st	Keith Knight	④	16
2nd	Manmeet Grewal	①	19	2nd	Jack Shafstall	③	17
The winner of this debate was				Elizabeth McConaghey Judge's Signature			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)				BASIS Scottsdale, Director School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>							

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Clear and succinct arguments made by Aff. ^{DA = dev aid}
 Aff's points held up under examination by Neg. ^{MA = military aid}
 Neg made initially very clear arguments but was weakened substantially by Aff's counters.

Summary

Dhishal offered several ^{pieces of evidence supporting} ~~points regarding~~
 1) military ineffective and 2) DA is only effective solution

Keith gave an excellent speech stating 1) military proves the way for stability 2) Military solves other abuses (human trafficking, kidnapping)

In Cross, Keith wasn't able to answer: How does Military Aid solve the problem. The Aff pressed forward claiming ~~that~~ the Neg's Afghan example of bad DA was outside the region. Keith responded that it is all terrorist groups. Very little meaningful questions directed at the Aff.

Manmeet spoke for the Aff and gave a very clear, logical, + well organized stmt strengthening their ~~argument~~ argument. He framed the debate in effectiveness, + asserted DA is most effective b/c it ↑ stability and ↑ economic success →

Key point by Manmeet: MA feels dehuman, DA
↓ dependence because they are strengthened + "pulled up",
+ it shld be prioritized b/c ~~it has been it~~ there has been it
↑ is the efficiency of assistance.

Jack, Speaker 4, made several good claims, but some
lacked evidential support. (i.e. MAd also stops
trafficking, slavery through ↑ police force).
He also suggested that education takes too long → a good
point in terms of prioritization that he revisited in
his final stmt.

2nd crossfire

- Excellent exchange in the beginning, no major point
won or lost.

Att attempted to have Neg agree that DA solves for
security issues + other issues, thus provides more
benefits. This is the best option. No ~~an~~ agreement from
Neg.

Summary 1

- main points: 1) Only example Neg gave of DA not working
is in Afghan., a completely distant region
2) DA ↑ several benefits
3) Neg never provides regional examples of
where MA worked.

Summary 2

- main points - DA doesn't work for stability + takes too long
- no real examples

Grand cross

Final stmts: Manmeet reiterated much of Sum 1 + his original
points b/c none had been refuted or dropped

Jack brought forth new arguments, but too late in the debate. He
argued that effectiveness shld be defined as # of lives saved.
~~Good argument~~ but ∴ MA better b/c it saves more lives.
~~Good~~ Compelling argument but I would have liked more evidence
on this thought + it shld have been raised earlier.

Final thoughts: Stronger case by Att, better evidence, very little points refuted;
several holes found in neg case that were never solved/closed.

PFD

FLIP: CP Waters - Elzarka v. CC Hunt - DeNicola

Public Forum Debate				Matthew Brandstetter (*FO,DT)			
Round 2				LL 145		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	DENICOLA		18	1st	ELZARKA		16
2nd	HUNT		16	2nd	WATERS		17-5
The winner of this debate was				Matthew F Brandstetter Judge's Signature			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)				FO			
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>				School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD:

I am persuaded that prioritization must be given to security and stability: progress is being made in this area which allows development assistance to be given to graduate students.

Evidence read in the round should at least contain an author's qualifications that may be referenced when the evidence is explicated after the round.

The issues in this round include

- ① Prioritization, i.e., which comes first, military aid or development assistance
- ② Solvency

Solvency → Aff wins by ^{IN} mistakenly stating that the Neg is demonstrating progress yet the Aff must show solvency - unreasonable burden caught and responded to in 1st ~~sum~~ summary.

Prioritization: → Rwanda-type genocide will occur again is a speculative leap; McDeermut evidence v Ramarathan evidence is a wash;

Stability progressing now evidenced by French leaving Mali Δ prioritization now goes to development assistance

Brooks study is not referenced in the evidence I am given to read;

PFD

FLIP: DH Mitina - Chung v. CP Kikkeri - Taylor*

Public Forum Debate				Gabriel Miller (*AG)			
Round 2				COWDN 213		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Taylor		16	1st	Mitina		17
2nd	Kikkeri		30	2nd	Chung		26
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)				Judge's Signature  Chaparral HS School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>							

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Oral Critique given

The negative did not respond to most points in the affirmative rebuttal, particularly on terrorism.

- Aff shared both why military assistance fails, and how provides stronger analysis on how developmental aid is a prerequisite to military aid.

The negative also ~~did not~~ dropped much of their offense after the constructive.

Speakers

Taylor: ~~very professional~~

- be more friendly, cordial, and professional.

- you went very fast in constructive but provided little content. Work on word economy. Build stronger aff & improve presentation

Kikkeri: - Fantastic rebuttal
- great organization & pace


Mitina: - very professional and collected

- work on analysis and organization
- word economy

Chung: - most of rebuttal was restatement of constructive.
little ground gained
- little evidence used
- use less "um"s

PFD

FLIP: FK Niu - Nagarajan v. AC Ferdowsian - Fox

Public Forum Debate				Lisa Lincoln (*FC)			
Round 2				LL 230		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Nagarajan	2	19	1st	Fox	4	17
2nd	Niu	1	20	2nd	Ferdowsian	3	18
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				 Judge's Signature Brady College Pres/Coach School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1st: Solid cross-ex & I like your argument about the definition
 - I may ask for the ketreus card, but I like the idea

BOTH: Don't understand why you don't because their situation

2nd: great metaphor & solid rebuttal going down the flow; thank you for extending Ethiopia

- big focus on solvency does you well

- you could have spent more time on contention 2 & their response about the different types of military aid

1st: bit too fast in summary but I could understand it
 - Should have let them ask a tad more in Grand CX... I like the aggressiveness but some judges may not.

RFD on back:



Fox: you should be able to answer the definition question

- good questions that go on big ideas

2nd: decent rebuttal; spend more time on their contention 2

- watch out for a double standard you seem to be creating

- good defense of definition

- Solvency is vital for your case... I don't feel the stuff you need satisfies that burden to get solvency

- the logical train of thought you give in summary ≠ solvency

- too much definition time in final focus

RFD: I affirm for a couple of reasons. First, ATF clearly was the agreement based on Ethiopia's drip system. Then extend it clean and NEG never touches it. I also feel NEG fails to provide solvency and ultimately I don't see a massive distinction between NEG's definition and the Petreus plan/idea. ~~even though~~ I think both sides have some double standards. Lack of NEG scheme for military aid = security & Ethiopia are who I affirm.

CHAN, ALVIN

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AF Seo - Lawrence v. CP Elzarka - Gutala

Public Forum Debate				Alvin Chan (*DO)			
Round 2				LL 14		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Lawrence	4	17	1st	Gutala	3	18
2nd	Seo	2	19	2nd	Elzarka	1	20
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <u>Negative</u> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____				 Judge's Signature Palo Verde High School School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Disclosed in round. Neg held up terrorism impact better

PFD

FLIP: DX Ricksecker - Mandolang v. FO Bach - Chung

Public Forum Debate				Mitchell Dyer (*DF)			
Round 2				LL 249		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Mandolang	3	19	1st	Chung	1	20
2nd	Ricksecker	4	19	2nd	Bach	2	20
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
(Circle Winner) Affirmative Negative Is this a low point win? Yes Yes				Mesquite/Bid Round Briefs School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:


Aff - pre-flow before the round.

Bach - you're a very eloquent speaker, but you don't need to yell.
(Nice power, though)

RFD: Military aid encompasses intervention (aff, that's what "services" means). What this round boils down to in my mind: things in the Sahel suck. We have plans to make it better. My vote is literally contingent on whether or not military aid helps or hurts. Those plans. Aff, this is a really precarious spot to be in and you really shouldn't let yourself fall into this proverbial pit. Aff is winning argument that military intervention leads to more violence and make things worse. Neg is winning the locust stuff, but I can't weigh that very well b/c the evidence does not say "50 million people will die/starve", it just says they will be effected. You can deal w/ locusts in other ways anyway. I wish aff did that. Alas, I affirm.

PFD

FLIP: FK Conklin - Dong v. DT Bopardikar - Misra

Public Forum Debate				Nick Davis			
Round 2				LL 10		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	4 Bopidikar		19	1st	3 Conklin		19
2nd	1 Misra		20	2nd	2 Dong		20
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				 Judge's Signature ASU School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

malaria
 poverty
 increases economic activity
 agro-forestry
 PK - not sahel card

Reasons
 can code terrorism arg
 agro-forestry

Neg

makes gov't rely on citizens
 dev aid undermines credit

dev aid decreases exports

turn-GMO arg
 UN PK - new enforcement rules
 less growth more disease more conflict

PFD

FLIP: CA Matteotti - Sweat v. DC McClure - Martin

Public Forum Debate				Satheesh Aradhyula (*AD)			
Round 2				LL 102		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	McClure	3	17	1st	Sweat	4	17
2nd	Martin	1	18	2nd	Matteotti	2	18
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				 Judge's Signature CFSAD, Tucson School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- * Cases for negative can be improved both in content and presentation.
- * Both teams need ~~you~~ to use their allotted times completely.
- * Affirmative argued that improved education through development assistance results in reduced poverty, & reduced violence, reduced terrorism. This point flowed through the rounds.
- * Negative team did not counter many (almost all) points made by affirmative team either in the case or during the cross fire. For example, aff. argued that a program called nets for life, & saved ~~now~~ numerous lives. Reduced mosquito borne illnesses. The con team ~~did not~~ pretty much allowed it to flow through.

PFD

FLIP: DT Xie - Bashar v. AG Schulman - Nguyen

Public Forum Debate				Neiko Chotras (*CC)			
Round 2				LL 105		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1 1st	Zabin Bashar		19	3 1st	Kendrick Nguyen		18
2 2nd	Stanley Xie		18	4 2nd	Levi Schulman		18
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)				Judge's Signature ASU/ Horizon / Student School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>							

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Everyone did a good job of creating arguments & responding to the arguments made by their opponents, but the neg team didn't have much evidence to support their arguments. The main argument that was made was about determining whether the aff case used developmental aid or humanitarian aid, and without a piece of evidence or definition to support this, the argument was kind of weak. The standard deviation argument was hard to follow as well because even the team making the argument seemed to be confused by it. Everyone still did a really great job and came up with some good attacks & responses.

PFD

FLIP: CA Kelly - Labban v. FO Palmer - Kim

Public Forum Debate				Julian Crown (*FK)			
Round 2				LL 114		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Kim	2	17	1st	Labban	4	15
2nd	Palmer	3	15	2nd	Kelly	1	27
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				 Judge's Signature Helene Beach School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

You cannot sell carbon sequestered by trees (I think)

Palmer: Why you gotta yell at me, dude? Chillax. Take a chill pill. whatever colloquialism you'd like is fine, but calm down! Especially in GCX.

App case was "totally rad" but I don't think I would know what you were talking about w/o prior experience.

BUYS, ADAM

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

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

Public Forum Debate				Adam Buys (*AD)			
Round 2				LL 43		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank	Points	Speaker	Negative	Rank	Points
1st	(3) Catie Sikora	(1-4)	20	1st	(1) Yingyu Sun	(1-4)	20
2nd	(4) Victoria Meyer		20	2nd	(2) Amber Guo		20
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <u>Negative</u> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>				<i>Adam Buys</i> Judge's Signature <i>Independence</i> School / Affiliation / Occupation			


DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I provided extensive oral critiques for any further questions
 Please email me out abuys@atgale.edu

PFD

FLIP: AJ Pulcifer - Asa v. DO Baduria - Spada

Public Forum Debate				Brian Gavlick (*DS)			
Round 2				LL 104		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank	Points	Speaker	Negative	Rank	Points
		(1-4)	(20-0)			(1-4)	(20-0)
1st	Spada	3	18	1st	Asa	4	17
2nd	Baduria	1	20	2nd	Pulcifer	2	19
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
(Circle Winner) Affirmative Negative Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				School / Affiliation / Occupation Desert Vista HS			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Asa - careful w/ time management in first speech

Thanks for 3 KVI! I'd like more impacts on your C2.

Pulcifer - impressive pace of speech, like Spada, but also like Spada ~~the~~ I lost some details toward the end. I questioned how you spent your time in first speech.

OK.

33 left

Spada - impressive pace of speech, but I lost you during C2 in first speech. Excluded impacts via KVI's.


Baduria - I liked your first speech the most, but I questioned your time management. I could have used less time spent on the root cause of poverty (your attack on Neg C1)

I really liked Negs C2 on the loss of gov. legitimacy via development aid, and I accepted Rewards as an example, but I had trouble evaluating the impacts of increased corruption, etc.

I don't see a major difference between providing guns vs. bullets. ~~Since~~ Both sides seem to accept C.B.A., so I ~~weigh~~ weigh ~~cost~~ saving lives ~~via~~ via healthcare vs. delegitimizing democracy, so I must vote to save lives so I vote aff.

PFD

FLIP: AO Ahooja - Isaacs v. DS Fedasiuk - Wakefield

Public Forum Debate				Rajan Sheth			
Round 2				LL 268		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Ahooja		20	1st	wakefield		18
2nd	Isaacs		17	2nd	Fedasiuk		19
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				 Judge's Signature <u>Asu / Student</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Peacekeepers needed for dev aid.

Reasons given orally.

PFD

FLIP: AX Akella - Garg v. CN Maitra - Gupta

Public Forum Debate				Phoebe Kuo			
Round 2				LL 263		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank	Points	Speaker	Negative	Rank	Points
1st	<u>Garg</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>17.5</u>	1st	<u>Gupta.</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>17.5</u>
2nd	<u>Akella.</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>17.5</u>	2nd	<u>Maitra.</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>17</u>
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature <u>Mountain View</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative <u>Negative</u>							
(Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? <u>yes.</u>							

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

55.

Comments & Reason for Decision: 54

- should say US military assistance exacerbates terror.
- should also understand how terror works
- be wary of cloud seeding enviro impacts.
→ like desertification.
- neg just means ball.
- talk about mechanisms.
- understand root cause. Inst.

- don't say "sorry"
- junta.
- make sure to impact democracy.
- ★ - should differentiate / better understand conventional "military aid" verses. peacekeeping + security forces.

warrant of equal which is "negate"

if you say "prerequisite" you win for me.

both have to stop fighting a CX.
→ ask questions.

TERRIBLE. why do I care about ends over means. when it means? ★
- stop being patronizing!!!

4 - c.

3 - cx.

2 summaries.

3 gex.

2 rebuttals.

dx > military on Sahel.

→ before neg is pre-requisite to all impacts.
→ role on internal link turn.

PFD

FLIP: FO Flores - Lee v. DT Lam - Raghib

Public Forum Debate				Raj Soni (*DH)			
Round 2				COWDN 218		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Raghib	1	19	1st	Lee	3	18
2nd	Lam	2	19	2nd	Flores	3	18
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			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff did better job of pointing out how development aid benefits more people to all the countries v.s. just the pockets that need military aid.

Neg overall did a very good job and it was close. Some more numbers to back up claims that most community health centers were not functioning would have been good. Effective point about long term v.s. short term in terrorism but no numbers yet available so just a theory like the "wildfire effect".

P1 PFD C2

FLIP: CN Sethi - Chavda v. AS Pierre - Draper

Public Forum Debate				Joel Underwood (*DD)			
Round 2				LL 243		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Chavda		15	1st	Pierre		18
2nd	Sethi		16	2nd	Draper		17
The winner of this debate was				Joel Underwood			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)				Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? <u>Yes</u>				DD			
				School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Con: Ok, as soon as you're telling me that we have no responsibility to help because Climate Change isn't happening you've pretty much lost me.

Both sides dropped your opponents' last contention.
STAY ORGANIZED!

In general there was too much responding to individual facts and stats and jumping all over the flow.

THOU SHALT NOT GET THE JUDGE LOST.
If I can't flow it, I can't weigh it.

Pro: Don't try to do both sides when you're speaking first in the 2nd round. That's the advantage of that position. HAMMER away on the opposite case.
Have to go PRO: Con was just asking me to buy more purely on their say so! PROVE IT.

CALLAN, KRIS

KUPERMAN, JEFFREY

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AG Blecker - Blecker v. DG Colvin - Okeefe

Public Forum Debate				Jeffrey Kuperman (*AO) Kris Callan Catalina Foothills			
Round 2				LL 271		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	D Blecker		18	1st	Colvin		16
2nd	AG Blecker		19	2nd	Okeefe		15
The winner of this debate was				Kris Callan Judge's Signature			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)				Catalina Foothills School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>							

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

CON

① Any form of Aid to Africa is harmful
 ← * This falls outside the scope of the resolution

* you are offering an alternate plan

② Developmental Aid

people are worse off after getting aid
 → Need more DIRECT Cause and Effect examples of why Aid is the cause of the problems

This was a difficult round to judge because it seems that that arguments were like comparing apples to oranges! Con Side needs to present a case that is more related to the Resolution!

Good job of presenting cases on both sides even though the Con argument was not on topic.

PRO

Developmental Aid should be prioritized over military.
 - you did a good job of arguing your case against the opponents' "off topic" case - that was a difficult task, but you did a good job.

- Good use of statistics
 - Good job of holding opponents accountable for more fact-based evidence.

PFD

FLIP: AS Freidman - Gummere v. AD Mazza - Russell

Public Forum Debate				Jonathan Garza			
Round 2				LL 272		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	<u>Gummere</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>17</u>	1st	<u>Russell</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>20</u>
2nd	<u>Freidman</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>17</u>	2nd	<u>Mazza</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>19</u>
The winner of this debate was							
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)				 Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>				<u>Independent</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Never say they don't know
 what they're talking about



- Mazza, don't be so sassy.

Off time road maps are silly!

RFD: Using cost-benefit analysis, I vote off of the
 Negs life impacts. I consider the terrorism a form
 of conflict because of Mali.

PFD

FLIP: AD Shibano - Rubalcava v. FD Kumar - Surendra

Public Forum Debate				Craig Skelton (*DN)			
Round 2				LL 150		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Rubalcava		18	1st	Surendra		17.5
2nd	Shibano		18	2nd	Kumar		17.5
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)				 Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? _____				 School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1


Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro proves lives saved through DA. DA prevent economic disparity which leads to civil war.
 Con makes decent points but has no answer to MA creating the opportunity for government collapse in Mali & Sudan.

Both teams spend too much time reading cards. Cut the evidence to the most important parts or summarize.

PFD

FLIP: AD Bai - Donovan v. AS Mills - Mills

Public Forum Debate				Jami Schulman (*AG)			
Round 2				LL 274		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	David Mills		17	1st	Bai		17
2nd	John Mills		17	2nd	Donovan		18
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) no Is this a low point win? <u>Yes</u>				 Judge's Signature Chaparral/Student School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD:

No clear voting points were given so I had to choose for myself. The neg's point on stability vacuum convinced me that military aid would have better long term impacts in the region than humanitarian military assistance.

Tips for both teams:

- Look at judges during CX
- Better organization

PFD

FLIP: DN Torpy - Apple v. CO Bryant - Riggs

Public Forum Debate				David Barclay (*DK)			
Round 2				LL 147		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Bryant	2	19	1st	Torpy	4	18.5
2nd	Riggs	1	19.5	2nd	Apple	3	18.5
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____				 Judge's Signature Barphy School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- I would explain per more ~~thoroughly~~ thoroughly in how you can do reality and too.
- ~~FFR~~
- Better expli- and spend time on per

- I wouldn't create ape in C/A, just a strategically sound. gives them a big link.
- I would've focused on intel, gives you great impacts that don't link.

Both should spend a lot of time on per because strategically it's the link to your cases -

Vote Aff OA winning Per and reversing Aff args from there.

PFD

FLIP: AG Kurtzman - Rowe v. CN Su - Gilliam

Public Forum Debate				Kylie Conway			
Round 2				COWDN 203		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Sue	3	18	1st	Rowe	2	19
2nd	Gilliam	4	17	2nd	Kurtzman	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? ☒ Y							

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Decision came down to the "global benefits" debate and "short term benefits" debate.

Neg won both these arguments because 1. Even if terrorists are "pushed into other regions" it gives them time to create stabilization + development in that area until moving on.

2. Global benefits can't be reached if aid is put into the wrong hands in the first place.

PFD

FLIP: CH Jones - Turner v. CP Saraf - Allen

Public Forum Debate				Mahir Qureshi (*FD)			
Round 2				LL 262		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Saraf		19	1st	Jones		19
2nd	Allen		20	2nd	Turner		18
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Basit Chandler School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative Negative							
(Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? No							

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg.

Prioritize: order of importance
National Security

- Countries ~~cannot~~ ^{need} help externally
 - military has to be developed
 - smuggling weapons
- Terrorism in ~~North~~ Africa
 - focus of US on Africa
 - high class weapons by terrorists
- ~~North~~ Pasture security
 - French
 - 2008, countries have good comm. when helping each other
 - gvt. Hassan Kurni steal assistance
 - not a long time fix
 - building a house in a burning area
 - food over women

Aff.


1. rapid pop. growth

- Growth 30 mil - 100 mil in Sahel
- food is increasing 40% but food banks 13% less food to each person
- Iran fertility rate decreased Bangladesh from 10
- 2. Problems that women face
 - equality of the sexes
 - 2.5% secondary or higher education among women
 - socioeconomic states
 - human rights over developing nation
 - corrupt military
 - EU make two development plans

2=20
-30
-40
50

PFD

FLIP: DC Garrett - Andrade v. CH Poole - Brescia

Public Forum Debate				Simone Saldana (*AH)			
Round 2				LL 264		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative DC	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative CH	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Garrett	2	17	1st	Poole	4	15
2nd	Andrade	1	18	2nd	Brescia	3	16
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			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

First speaker did a good job on delivery of his speech. Cross fire was really good. Evidence was excellent. Grand crossfire was very good.

First speaker did a good job on her speech. Cross fire was really good. Evidence was good. Grand crossfire was very good.

Second Speaker delivery was really good. Evidence was excellent, memorization was great! Crossfire, did a really good job!! Grand crossfire was very good.

Second speaker did a good job. First speaker seemed a little more prepared. Speech was a little short. Crossfire was really good!! Grand crossfire was very good.


The reason for my decision is I feel that they rebutted their side better than the other side. I felt they were a little stronger on their evidence.

ANDERSON, MATT

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DD Atkins - Atkins v. DT Sahoo - Papakipos

Public Forum Debate				Matt Anderson (*CA)			
Round 2				LL 2		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	C Atkins	3	16	1st	Papakipos	2	17
2nd	L Atkins	1	18	2nd	Sahoo	4	14
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <u>Negative</u> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>yes</u>				 Judge's Signature <u>Red Mountain</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

oral

PFD

FLIP: DT Jagadeesh - Thirumalai v. CN Han - Foster

Public Forum Debate				Becky Andrade (*DC)			
Round 2				LL 47		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Thirumalai	18		1st	Han	16	
2nd	Jagadeesh	17		2nd	Foster	19	
The winner of this debate was				Angela Buzan Perry HS Judge's Signature			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)				School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? N							

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Thirumalai

(A)

0: Oxford - good Prioritized good

① Lack of education → Prevents poverty
80% = no access

② Climate change
95% food = rain ag.
rising temp, costs

③ Terrorism
root causes poverty & hunger
1% ↑ in \$ ↓ terrorism

(B)

④ Military aid escalates conflict hatred.
- Can't solve for whole problem
- millions/famine
Poverty root of "all evil"
[Smugglers adapt routes
they never said how military would solve.

new evidence? 60% ↑ terrorism
"kills more people" - no article just a list of
etc. etc. etc.

Han C/B Framework

① Instability
- terrorism
- bribery → murder
- attacks increasing. Short term action important
② Minimizes illegal activity
(drugs, smuggling, trafficking)
French example

③ Terrorism increasing on govt buildings
④ Short term scale = safety via military
- \$ to kill ambassadors is
very convincing, but how effective has our war on terror been so far?
Is the solution actually short-term?
re: education: those institutions are attacked. - yes - good attack

conceded

Very good speech

change this wording

HAN - be assertive during cross!

PFD

FLIP: CN Chew - Diyya v. DF Goulet - Bua

Public Forum Debate				Arthur Chandra (*DX)			
Round 2				LL 240		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Bua	2	16	1st	Diyya	4	14
2nd	Goulet	1	18	2nd	Chew	3	15
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)				 Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>				Redlands HS School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Comment was given in Round

PFD

FLIP: AK Russell - Ferguson v. AX Thakar - Saha

Public Forum Debate				Hannah Shoell (*DA)			
Round 2				LL 265		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Kara		2 19	1st	Thakar		3 17
2nd	Jake		1 19	2nd	Saha		1 16
The winner of this debate was Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>yes</u>				 Judge's Signature Copper Hills School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1A: you should know your case well enough to not have to rely on the physical copy of your case in the crossfire. Reading your blocks isn't super effective in this round because they don't defend immediately.

2A: hold your papers in your speech so you don't have to hunch over. You are making smart targs, but you need to answer the case of their neg - they say that you are colonialist, you have to answer that more directly.

1N: you seem to let your partner dominate the round. You make really smart arguments, make sure you have a presence in the round as well.

2N: STOP STEALING PREP!!! When running a discourse K, you should be careful of gendered language, that would have been a very easy way out for the aff. Let your opponent answer questions in crosser.

1 vote neg. The link to the K is uncontested, the ~~neg~~ neg wins root cause.

PFD

FLIP: DF Ong - Silva v. FD Shah - Hu

Public Forum Debate				Kiran Arimilli (*DT)			
Round 2				SS 236		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Ong	2	18 (28)	1st	Shah	3	17 (27)
2nd	Silva	1	19 (29)	2nd	Hu	4	16 (26)
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			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Ong & Silva win

① prove Neg has no solution for health and ~~climate~~ climate

- G.O. to do budget: 77.5 starve

② prove that millions will die w/o div asset
 poor.

③ Turn Neg case

- prove corruption & violence w/
 w/ military aid.

PFD

FLIP: FC Bacon - Colfax v. CN Guo - Sadler

Public Forum Debate				Kristin Andreatos (*AG)			
Round 2				LL 45		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Sadler	4	17	1st	Colfax	3	18
2nd	Guo	2	19	2nd	Bacon	1	19
The winner of this debate was Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)				 Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				Chaparral/teacher School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Sadler: would like to see more evidence
 3rd contention very rushed

Guo: strong pts on cross & in constructive (need evidence)
 very clear speaker.

*remember cross is ? & answer-
 don't make speeches

weakest pt - needed us. effective
 strongest pt - food production/biofuel

Colfax: try to use all time
 good pts in cross - climate change & evidence

Bacon: great speaker - very clear
 very strong constructive

weakest pt - ↓ terrorism
 strongest pt - missing \$ (developmental aid)

PFD

FLIP: DH Yang - Haider v. FC Kelehan - Miller

Public Forum Debate				Angela Buzan (*DC)			
Round 2				LL 109		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Yang	1	20	1st	Kelehan	4	18
2nd	Haider	3	19	2nd	Miller	2	19
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Perry HS School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____							

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

(Excellent eye contact and speaking skills from both sides!)

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Yang:

Cont 1) Econ. Benefits

- Increased hh. income
- Micro fin
- Long term projects

Cont 2) Health Infra.

- Malaria
- Poor Infra leads to

Cont 3) Pol. Transitions

- Promote Democracy
- Fewer deaths / higher life ex.

Solid use of sources
Great speaking power

Haider:

military aid ↑ terrorism
13926

Cont 1) Stability

- micro financing
- French aid (M) in Mali only moved terror
- Dev. aid creates accountability

Cont 2) Health Infra.

- malaria

Excellent Rebuttal

Kelehan:

Cont 1) Stability
- Corruption

Cont 2) Aid is not sent to Ave. African
- Sent to rich
- aid policy incorrect

Cont 3) Military Aid begets...
- dev. w/o military ineffective

Great use of numbers but

Miller:

TSCT

Cont 1) Aid doesn't reach the needy

Cont 2) Aid create dependancy
- Despite aid; area still poor

Cont 3) Mil. Aid creates stability
- leads to dev. aid

Cont 3) Democracy
- threats undermine democracy

Good Pacing

Good use of world view of past for aid (military focus) and specific statistics. Strong defense of your own case, and even stronger rebuttal.

Great use of Mali example and strong cohesive argument; focused too much on defending own case; and not on attacking opponents

Time 30
1:30

Time 20
40

Slow down a little

4 4
3
4 4
3

2 2
3
2 2

PFD

FLIP: CN Ramesh - Wang v. DT Lu - Liu

Public Forum Debate				Leila Hosseini (*AG)			
Round 2				LL 60		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Liu	1	20	1st	Ramesh	4	18
2nd	Lu	2	19	2nd	Wang	3	19
The winner of this debate was				Judge's Signature			
AFF <u>Affirmative</u> Negative				Chaparral			
(Circle Winner)				School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>							

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Liu 2 obs: prioritize nonmilitary less of life
 C1: development - food & security health, displacement
 A: desertification } great evidence!
 B: locusts
 C2: Education long term econ welfare enrollment, GDP, terror
Lu C1 → unmitigated radicalism development food & edu solves perpetuation
 C2 → "don't prove milit intervention prevents solves terror
 C3 → Nigeria not part of Sahel?
 you two are excellent speakers great evidence
Lu → eval in best for long term stability
 ultimately → Neg lacks ev and spends too much time in defense
 Prompts not well attacked

I don't buy that development aid includes military aid; however, development assistance prioritization does not mean that all military aid withdrawn. → this goes PRL

Ramesh obs: must convince counter terror
 C1: corrupt gov. - need milit. to distribute
 A: directness needed Mali
 B: terrorism - interfere w/ elections
 C3: money does not get where it needs to go - Nigeria

Wang milit haves more lives → no cv.
 elections → this is a great point please emp more

Ramesh, please speak slower, you lack clarity
 Wang, your style is difficult to follow but very clear during CX
 sometimes make claims w/o clear ev.

PFD

FLIP: DT Huang - Chona v. DZ Lala - Levitt

Public Forum Debate				Tiffany Tibbetts (*FG)			
Round 2				LL 248		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Lala	3	19.5	1st	Huang	1	20
2nd	Levitt	4	19.5	2nd	Chona	2	20
The winner of this debate was Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>				 Judge's Signature GCA School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Great Debate from both teams.
 Try to focus on more than just
 the numbers.

Con won on contention showing that
 military aide can solve terrorism and
 other issues.

PFD

FLIP: AG Artigue - Ramaswamy v. DK Ramos - Bathla

Public Forum Debate				Dominic Navalta (*CN)			
Round 2				LL 103		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Sergio Ramos	4	17	1st	Anita Ramaswamy	2	20
2nd	Herman Bathla	3	17	2nd	Heidi Artigue	1	20
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____				 Judge's Signature Presentation HS. School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PFD

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

Public Forum Debate				Nicholas Petsas (*AS)			
Round 2				LL 247		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Ziaee		19	1st	Dupree		20
2nd	Shen		19	2nd	Karbo		20
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>Yes</u>				 Judge's Signature <u>Salpointe / U of A</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Time your speech. You had almost 30 sec left so you could have gone much slower, though I thought the speed was fine.

You wasted alot of time in your intro to your constructive, just get to the point.

Pro: The pro side has won this debate by having specific evidence of dev. and actually having successes within the Sahel region as well as proving that giving weapons to Rebels in Malibus only caused more violence.

PFD

FLIP: DT Bhatnagar - Wadhwa v. FG Nobby - Dowell

Public Forum Debate				Jonathan MacMillan (*AA)			
Round 2				LL 149		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank	Points	Speaker	Negative	Rank	Points
		(1-4)	(20-0)			(1-4)	(20-0)
1st	Wadhwa	2	19	1st	Nobby	4	16
2nd	Bhatnagar	1	19	2nd	Dowell	3	16
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Dougherty Valley HS School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>							

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision: Aff case was largely unrefuted. Aff shows that economic insecurity leads to violence and direct aid to people, not leaders, helps solve.

Wadhwa

Nobby

Bhatnagar

Dowell

I. Resources a. Food Security (Breeding ground for terrorism) b. Water (Refugees) - Desalination & pipelines II. Bad Drugs a. Fake pharmaceuticals b. Needles III. Economic Development a. Education (Youth is destabilizing factor) b. Micro lending (Brought 10 million out of poverty in Bangladesh)	DA = 1 I. Security & Stability - Al Qaeda - Afghanistan highway II. Aid increases corruption - Diverted from health educ. III. ↑ aid = ↑ poverty	Peacekeeping is non-topical → 95% of terror attacks due to military aid - African leaders let humanitarians help → Aid = ↓ Corruption → Aff aid is different	II. → Security is a prerequisite III. → Average African is doing worse now than in 1970s - Military Aid, then DA. Lack of security in region
• Peacekeepers is a terrible idea • DA addresses root cause			

Nobby - No offense

- American way of life → too late in rebuttals

PFD

FLIP: CC Goodman - McCollum v. AH McGraw - Baca

Public Forum Debate				Tracy Palmer (*FO)			
Round 2				LL 160		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank	Points	Speaker	Negative	Rank	Points
1st	Marc Goodman	3rd (1-4)	16	1st	Ashley McGraw	2nd (1-4)	17
2nd	Hunter McCollum	1st	18	2nd	Natalie Bacci	4th	15
The winner of this debate was <u>Affirmative</u> Negative (Circle Winner)				Tracy Palmer Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>				Fairmont Prep School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF: Hunter: You're a good Speaker
 And Great job on your explanation
 of Prioritization I liked your analogy
 of the 7 people.

Marc: Good job on first Speech, but you need
 to work a little more on your final focus
 Speech. Give me the voting issues and
 clearly tell me why you win

NEG:


Ashley & Natalie: You did a good
 job, but watch your aggressiveness
 in the round. You are both great
 Speakers and if you remain calm
 the case is more solid.

Ashley: I like your summary speech
 it was good explanation of your case.

RFD: In the end the Affirmative's case / definition and Framework
 for Prioritization won the round.

PFD

FLIP: CN Rudrapatna - Phan v. DH Kim - Soni

Public Forum Debate				Natasha Iyer (*AX)			
Round 2				LL 148		Fri 01/10/14 12:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-0)
1st	Soni	2	19	1st	Rudrapatna	3	16
2nd	Kim Kim	1	19	2nd	Phan	4	16
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? ☒ No				 Judge's Signature S. Francis School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1

Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~Pro asserts Links~~ Con asserts Links, but doesn't actually present ev to substantiate ~~mil~~ mil = prereq.
 Con treats pro args as taglines ~~and~~ and does not actually respond to anything more than key words. ~~Pro voters stand~~ Pro voters stand ~~for~~ ∴ pro ballot.
 [Con does no work to show lack of burden ext. to] assertions. Also pro "a" stability.