PETSAS, NICHOLAS

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AG Schulman - Nguyen v. DK Ramos - Bathla

Public Forum Debate	Nicholas Petsas (*AS)	
Round 3	LL 263	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Nguyen	1 19	1st	Bathla	18 3
2nd	Schulman	2 19	2nd	Ramos	18 4

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Judge's Signature

Salpointe / U of A

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: The Pro won this debate b/c they showed using superior & specific evidence from the IMF & elsewhere that dev. assist. actually works. As far as terror is concerned it's a wash because the military aid given before the crisis was not sufficient to stop it which then required more military assistance to quell the failed military assistance aka... a wash so the Pro wins on development impacts.

KUO, PHOEBE

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DZ Warburton - Wong v. DH Meyer - Sikora

Public Forum Debate	Phoebe Kuo	
Round 3	LL 241	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	Cole Warburton	1	19	1st	Cates Sikora	2	18
2nd	Jacob Wong	3	17.5	2nd	Victoria Meyer.	4	17

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? no

Judge's Signature

Montan Chen.

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

131 (51)

should say short term dev key to long term. since Ø focus on long term of our thinking is only eating.

→ good, but how govt uses PK to uphold
→ seems legit
→ does the stuff,

time allocation -

1:46

if DA ↓ econ dev.
does MA ↓ govt dev?

the 2 has a poor understanding of the world.
the 2 also needs arguments that aren't "they have no evidence"
→ there are sources for everything, doesn't mean they are good

stop making arguments on CX.
sometimes, listening / being patient shows perceptual dominance,

△ positions
△ signposting.
root cause claims are a bad idea.

Malt Ø important -

centralized government good assumption not good.

pure reg arg good but dropped turns.

of

UNDERWOOD, JOEL **2014 ASU Southwest Championship**

2C **PFD** 1P

FLIP: DF Ong - Silva v. AG Blecker - Blecker

Public Forum Debate	Joel Underwood (*DD)	
Round 3	LL 149	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	D. Blecker	16	1st	Ong	15
2nd	A. Blecker	19	2nd	Silva	18

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Judge's Signature: Joel Underwood

School / Affiliation / Occupation: DD

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

JUnderwood@seattleacademy.org (flow mailed on request)

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Con was basically doing Policy style, especially first speaker. Either don't ask for paradigm OR follow. Don't ask then ignore.

VERY good PRO final focus. Made it clear that I can choose to attack symptoms or roots.

D Blecker: can't disappear in Grand XF!

Con lost me too many times with speed. As such, I probably lost the full force of some of your arguments/data.

Too much of the CON case depends on things that WILL happen (military killing terrorists, etc). Vulnerable to PRO asking for proof cause/effect will bear out.

DAVIS, NICK

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: CO Bryant - Riggs v. CP Saraf - Allen

Public Forum Debate	Nick Davis	
Round 3	LL 147	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	1 Saraf	19	1st	2 Riggs	19
2nd	3 Allen	18	2nd	4 Bryant	18

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Will Gaub
Judge's Signature

ASU
School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

dev aid
40% inc food - 13% less /person
family planning - dec. in pop.
women - No school due to preg.
human rights violations by UN PK

Reasoning
human rights vs. basic living improvement

Neg
Dev aid req. security to work
military aid req. for Darfur res.
Dev leads to marginalized women

SKELTON, CRAIG **2014 ASU Southwest Championship**

PFD

FLIP: AJ Pulcipher - Asa v. DX Jung - Frehner

Public Forum Debate	Craig Skelton (*DN)	
Round 3	LL 114	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	Jung	2	18	1st	Asa	4	17.5
2nd	Frehner	1	18	2nd	Pulcipher	3	17.5

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Craig Skelton
Judge's Signature

Manst
School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Round comes down to who solves stability. Pro offers multiple instances of MA failing to achieve goals. Con limits themselves to TSTCI but does not effectively show solvency.

Pro largely drops food security. Con does not focus enough on DA increasing terror + inequality

Bnzan

~~MARTIN, ALYSSA~~

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DT Panja - Nakos v. DA Almanza - Raso

Don't feed your partner answers - it makes her look weak

Snakey wa of time

Public Forum Debate	Alyssa Martin	
Round 3	LL 14	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	Almanza	4	16	1st	Nakos	3	18
2nd	Razo	1	20	2nd	Panja	2	19

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Angela Bnzan
Judge's Signature

Perry HS
School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Nakos Don't be smug. Don't interrupt or attack with cross.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Nakos

CON (A)

Organizations w/ capacity to aid

(1) military aid prerequisite
aid → success

(2) retaliation
- border security
- coop → security
- conflict in Mali

strong sources

3:45

Panja (B)

re: climate change can't simply fix - LES, the Poisonwood Bible effect

re: food options destroyed by violence

re: food market $

re: Aid more effective after stabilization — yes

"Why hasn't military aid worked before?" - no answer.

card? rich scouted by terrorist organizations. Do you mean funding? Requires both.

card? 2.3x more effective in violent societies

Almanza

PRO (A)

give me timeline impact calc.

(a) Priority

(1) Climate change → agriculture
conservation
rotation [implied: teach them how?]
health... trailed off
- "50+ examples we can show" - interesting. Never seen this tactic before

not sure how long crop yeilds would take to reform.

Razo (B)

re: military prerequisite
terrorists live in law-ec. regions
US example
[solves] for terrorism through peace

how does it solve? show me.

re: terrorism is not the only issue.
- mothers & hunger. PATHOS

you want a personal source?
[you are a phenomenal speaker, but you're unorganized.]

"other team not doing anything."
- Almanza - develop your rhetorical vocab.

Forces are already present.

Chen, Taylor
~~CHAN, ALVIN~~

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DH Lee - Lee v. AO Curtis - DeTaboada

Public Forum Debate	~~Alvin Chan (*DO)~~	
Round 3	LL 108	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	H Lee 1	19	1st	Curtis 3	18
2nd	S Lee 2	19	2nd	DeTaboada 4	18

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Judge's Signature

Physician.

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff: good job reiterating each of your contentions. be careful of cutting people off during cross-x. good point by point rebuttals.

Neg: like your use of definitions to inform the judge. Delivery could be polished up a bit, but solid performance.

Ackeroyd

~~GARRETT~~, BRANDON

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DZ Tennakoon - Grewal v. DT Lam - Raghib

Public Forum Debate	Brandon Garrett (*CP)	
Round 3	LL 145	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker Charminade **Affirmative**	Points (0-20)	Speaker Harker **Negative**	Points (0-20)
1st Dhishal Tennakoon 3	17 ~~28~~	1st Emaad Raghib 2	18 ~~28~~
2nd Manmeet Grewal 4	16 ~~24~~	2nd Alexander Lam 1	19 ~~29~~

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Nope

Judge's Signature

Presentation HS.

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

SRINIVAS, DESIREE
~~SHOEL, HANNAH~~
* pushed ballot

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DX Lim - Tang v. AS Pierre - Draper

Public Forum Debate	~~Hannah Shoel (JDG)~~ DESIREE SRINIVAS (w/ Hamilton)	
Round 3	LL 270	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	Lim	2	15	1st	Pierre	1	15
2nd	Tang	4	12	2nd	Draper	3	14
			27				30

30 sec
1 min
30 sec

33 sec
~~1 min~~
30 sec

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Judge's Signature

Hamilton
School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- very heated crossfire btwn 1st opponents → turned into question of why they're debating
- Tang had problems with argumentation points at first, but developed more as he went on
- great eyecontact from both teams. - did falter a little at first.
- Pierre & Draper - laptops used (noted to keep track)
  - used resources from online?
- P&D were more conversational, had good effect on their argument presentation
- 2nd speaker crossfire did not address as much to help determine which argument was stronger
- Lim was direct, passionate, & had good eye contact.
- Pierre - used definitions to support clarifications - helped argument clarity - promoted both sides
- great arg. on both sides
- attacks were justified, but some were not expanded on
- both teams were very passionate

KUPERMAN, JEFFREY

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: CH Jones - Turner v. CN Chew - Diyya

Public Forum Debate	Jeffrey Kuperman (*AO)	
Round 3	LL 268	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	Jones	2	18	1st	Diyya	4	17
2nd	Turner	1	19	2nd	Chew	3	18

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Jeffrey Kuperman
Judge's Signature

Carlsbad HS
School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NAVALTA, DOMINIC **2014 ASU Southwest Championship**

PFD

FLIP: FC Kelehan - Miller v. FG Nobby - Dowell

Public Forum Debate	Dominic Navalta (*CN)	
Round 3	LL 43	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st (2)	Kelehan	16 ~~26~~	1st	Nobby (4)	14 ~~24~~
2nd (1)	Miller	17 ~~27~~	2nd	Dowell (3)	15 ~~25~~

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

Hamilton

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Negative

No framework

- "Corrupt"
- — Frequently says "um"
- — Question asked by Aff. unable to be answered
- ½ Hypothetical answers to Aff. contentions
- Weapons only belong in American hands "Peacekeepers"

Prep:
30 sec
30 sec
10 sec
50 sec

Affirmative

Framework: Most beneficial

- Theiving insignificant if nothing to steal
- Food, water, money = developmental aid
- + Fluid, professional speaking (rarely pauses or says "um")
- Don't put guns & rockets in "corrupt hands
- + "Terror and crime stem from poverty" - Neg. Provide aid to end poverty
- + Statistics stronger than Neg.

Prep: 45 sec
75 sec

A	4
B	4
CX	3
A	4
B	4
CX	3
A	2
B	2
CX	3
A	2
B	2

SALDANA, SIMONE

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DS Carlton - Schieke v. FO Palmer - Kim

Public Forum Debate	Simone Saldana (*AH)	
Round 3	LL 262	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative FO		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative DS		Points (0-20)
1st	Palmer	2	17	1st	Carlton	4	15
2nd	Kim	3	16	2nd	Schieke	1	18

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative / **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Judge's Signature

Carter

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

First speaker did a great job on delivery. Spoke clear. Evidence was really good. Cross fire was really good. Rebuttle was really good.

First speaker delivery was clear & organized. Good evidence. Cross fire was really good. Rebuttle was good!

Second speaker did a really good job on delivery. Evidence was really good also. Cross fire did a really good job. Rebuttle was also really good.

Second speaker did a great job on her delivery! Evidence was really good! Crossfire was excellent. Rebuttle was excellent.

The reason for my decision is that I thought that they rebuttled stronger, their argument was more believable. The second speaker was the stronger of the two speakers. She was merely convincing on her speech.

BRANDSTETTER, MATTHEW **2014 ASU Southwest Championship**

PFD

FLIP: AK Russell - Ferguson v. CH Poole - Brescia

Public Forum Debate	Matthew Brandstetter (*FO,DT)	
Round 3	LL 160	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

RANKS	Speaker	Affirmative (going 2nd)	Points (0-20)	RANKS	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1	1st	FERGUSON	16.5	3	1st	POOLE	12
2	2nd	RUSSELL	16	4	2nd	BRESCIA	10
		mfb mfb					

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Matthew F Brandstetter
Judge's Signature

FO
School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

2N: use the totality of your time to refute your opponent's case

RFD:

Negative essentially drops entirety of Aff case

1. Development must come before stability
2. Landmines
3. AIDs

Responding to Aff case after you have had an opportunity to respond and did not is futile because these arguments have already been lost.

1N: be careful w/ extensive use of "okay" and the word "thing."
1A: "stuff" is rather generic – you can come up w/ a better, more specific word
1A: good final summary

Final focus speeches should have identifiable, delineated, voting issues

KRAGER, BRODERICK **2014 ASU Southwest Championship**

PFD

FLIP: CN Guo - Sadler v. DT Sahoo - Papakipos

Public Forum Debate	Broderick Krager (*AJ)	
Round 3	LL 240	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	Sadler	3	17	1st	Papakipos	2	18
2nd	Guo	1	20	2nd	Sahoo	4	17

25

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? no

Judge's Signature

Sunnyslope

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Sadler - Great use of speed. I think you spend too much time on definitions. Have them for reference but you don't need to say all of them. Thank you for asking for a time frame! Great point!

Guo - Great attacks! Thank you for clarifying the time frame thing in crossfire. And you called for exactly the right cards. The only thing I would want from your rebuttal is for you to point out logical fallacies of the other team.

Papakipos - Holy shit thats a lot of big numbers. Slow down so I can write these down. Why does military aid stabilize countries? Have more confidence in crossfire! Amazing summary! Where were these points before?

Sahoo - Yes, I do see you playing with your hair. WHY is military aid a prerequisite? This is a good argument but you aren't making it. Your attacks don't make a whole lot of sense. As population increases, there are more mouths to feed, increasing starvation. This does make sense.

RFD - starvation - pro wins - it is an impact right now as well as future
watch your likes and ums!
terror - pro wins - just pushing around without solving the cause
women - con wins - culture does not allow for change, Niether side fixes this.
disease - pro wins - low impact.
drugs - con wins - pro had no empirical evidence, just extended terror attack
stability - pro wins - hunger is the root of the problem

BARCLAY, DAVID **2014 ASU Southwest Championship**

PFD

FLIP: DD Karbo - Dupree v. CP Ramprasad - Heylman

Public Forum Debate	David Barclay (*DK)	
Round 3	LL 148	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Heylman	17	1st	Dupree	18.5
2nd	Ramprasad	17.5	2nd	Karbo	19

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Judge's Signature

Brophy

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~1:20~~ :45

Neg wins prec req argument that Mil did cases before dev. aid I can go neg on that argument as nothing else left has matters in that context

IYER, NATASHA

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DX Kirjwal - Aman v. FC Bacon - Colfax

Public Forum Debate	Natasha Iyer (*AX)	
Round 3	LL 109	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	Colfax	3	16	1st	Kejriwal	2	15
2nd	Bacon	1	19.5	2nd	Amaar	4	16

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Judge's Signature

St. Francis

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Prior to Focus

If I buy pro framework, pro wins because you ask for greatest NEED in Sahel. Pro ~~only~~ is the only team ~~who~~ who quantifies IN SAHEL. No ev on Neg except Mali is Sahel specific, but no ev is given for ①s even there. I mean, there's contention 1, but it's not quantified clearly. Really neither team does enough work to WIN the debate, but Pro ~~has~~ has a clearer narrative.

After focus

Con - still no quantification or ~~#~~ clear demonstration of need.

Pro - stays consistent w/ narrative. (granted inaff. clash on bothsides)

to be fair, I don't buy framework but they concede it so...

ANDERSON, MATT **2014 ASU Southwest Championship**

PFD

FLIP: FO Bach - Chung v. AH McGraw - Baca

Public Forum Debate	Matt Anderson (*CA)	
Round 3	LL 150	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	Chung	3	18	1st	McGraw	4	18
2nd	Bach	1	20	2nd	Baca	2	19

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

MAT Anderson
Judge's Signature

Red Mountain
School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirmative's evidence out weighed the negative's evidence. Negative needed concrete, proven examples or statistics of military aid working and what the effects of it were. Aff's evidence was almost torn apart by neg analysis but in the end, weak statistics are better than nothing. Very good round!! Very good speakers all around, especially Bach.

* Stability is the word, not stabability *

ROLFE, KATHERINE

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AO Muddukrishna - Sharma v. DO Baduria - Spada

Public Forum Debate	Katherine Rolfe (*CN)	
Round 3	COWDN 215	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	Spada	4	13	1st	Mudeukrishna	2	18
2nd	Baduria	3	15	2nd	Sharma	1	19

:36

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? no

Kat Rolfe
Judge's Signature

Hamilton / Judge & Mentor
School / Affiliation / Occupation

1:00
:35

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AF don't be so vague!!
- Read sentence not speed mumble, there was no inflection and to fast so hard to even know your points
- Range statistics are good, but not near as strong.
- good show of change with each program you mentioned
- using exact people and what they have said to support
- difference between humanitarian aid & others
- direct aid, not just dumping food, but providing agriculture
- structure your advocating for
- know what your talking about don't jump between topics.
- don't give in, carful & slow down so you don't make a verbal mistake in their favor.
- long term, stability & innovation how?
- more specificity of what it is
- corruption?
- need to know true definitions.
- how is it going to drive prices down? How are you going to do that?
- mismanagement of aid
- funding death? How would you do it differently?
- infrastructure being built? up
- don't say what he brought restate

Neg
- could diction maintain it so I can hear your points
- good statistics with specific ones for each point. showing more than two is strong & provides good proof
- marginal difference, good
- strong points that cover field
- no topical? change in definition
- security concerns of military aid on terrorists groups
- Basic definitions good! to really understand what AF is saying.
- food aid → humanitarian
- productivity
- improving wages
- corruption - military building
- absense, good use of others
- short term aid supported by military
- good withdrawn point. & what suceses? none
- good targetting questions that he agrees with & then hitting him with what it means
- impactful unless military
- who builds infrastructure?
- 1 example vs. 10 examples
- Restate all 10 countries/ex.
- Prioritize growth
- aid being withdrawn

Skala

~~HUSSAIN, SYED~~

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AS Freidman - Gummere v. CN Rudrapatna - Phan

Public Forum Debate	Syed Hussain (*DH)	
Round 3	LL 273	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Gummere (4)	17	1st (1)	Rudrapatna	20
2nd	Freidman (2)	19	2nd (3)	Phan	18

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative** (Negative circled)

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Shawna Skala
Judge's Signature

South Anchorage
School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

(1) Stability and security are required to secure any type of aid, even humanitarian aide. Neg use of security and stability with military aide well done with assertion that inadequacy in this area leads to war — not specific as to external or internal but point well taken.

(2) Aff did an excellent job at defending humanitarian aid as a tenet but did not provide adequate CLEAR tie to how this can occur without security and stability. They did push for this strengthening the country but did not logically address the security aspect without which violence and instability increase.

All were good speakers and the topic itself was difficult for analysis due to time constraints in this format. Valiant effort to explicate a complicated issue.

TIBBETTS, TIFFANY

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DH Mitina - Chung v. AD Rubin - Irfan

Public Forum Debate	Tiffany Tibbetts (*FG)	
Round 3	LL 230	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Mitma 1	18	1st	Irfan 3	16
2nd	Chung 2	18	2nd	Rubin 4	15

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Judge's Signature

GCA

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- make sure your evidence is well organized so you don't waste time finding it.
- Don't say crap even if you forgot what study it was. LOL ☺.

It's not koshur to ask a judge what school they are from. Especially mid-round.

Rubin your volume is too loud for this small space. You have a very stacatto (sp?) speech pattern that makes it hard to follow your arguments.

- Don't say you don't want any prep and then use up 15-20 shuffling papers.

Neg said Big terrorists groups are alread gone. If they are already gone then won't it be open for other aide.

I buy the aff's arguement that poverty leads to instability + terrorism - + so if we elleviate (sp?) poverty we elleviate poverty -

MILLER, GABRIEL

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AD Relich - Aradhyula v. CX Ahrens - Lathrop

Public Forum Debate	Gabriel Miller (*AG)	
Round 3	SS 314	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	2.) Aradhyula	18	1st	4.) Lathrop	18
2nd	3.) Relich	18	2nd	1.) Ahrens	18

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Gabriel Miller
Judge's Signature

Chaparral HS
School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg wins Framework and terrorism.

- No weighing mechanism or voting issues given
- Aff dropped much of own offense

Hauser

~~GARZA, JONATHAN~~

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: CS Thomas - Friend v. FD Shah - Hu

Public Forum Debate	**Jonathan Garza**	
Round 3	**LL 271**	**Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM**

Speaker	**Affirmative**	Points (0-20)	Speaker	**Negative**	Points (0-20)
1st	Thomas	2 17	1st	Shah	1 20
2nd	Friend	4 15	2nd	Hu	3 16

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Samantha Hauser
Judge's Signature

Palo Verde HS
School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The Neg carries through their main args that went untouched by the Aff. The Aff also goes for a 50/50 ish split of Military & development in the middle of the Round while the unanswered definition of "prioritize" by the neg in the INC says they win if military is ≥ developmental. The Aff tries to say it's abusive at the end but it's too little too late. The Neg outlines clear reasons for me to vote for them and the aff leaves theirs strongest Points alone (disease, govt, education).

* Use CX to your advantage! Find the flaws in their case and pt them out. Make them agree with you.

Mooney

~~MACMILLAN, JONATHAN~~

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DF Goulet - Bua v. CP Waters - Elzarka

Public Forum Debate	Jonathan MacMillan (*AA)	
Round 3	LL 106	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Amy Elzarka	20	1st	Bella Bua	20
2nd	Anna Waters	20	2nd	Ryley Goulet	20

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 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Peela

~~KARJALA, DENNIS~~

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: FK Niu - Nagarajan v. DT Xie - Bashar

Public Forum Debate	Dennis Karjala (*CS)	
Round 3	LL 264	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Nagarajan	20	1st	Bashar	20
2nd	Niu	20	2nd	Xie	20

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

Chandler

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Oral

Calhoun

~~DAVENPORT, GABI~~

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AX Akella - Garg v. FO Flores - Lee

Public Forum Debate	Gabi Davenport (*CC)	
Round 3	LL 10	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	CON ~~Affirmative (PRO)~~	Points (0-20)	Speaker	PRO ~~Negative (CON)~~	Points (0-20)
1st	Garg	18	1st	Lee	17
2nd	Akella	20	2nd	Flores	20

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

BASIS Phoenix

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Lee - speak a bit slower -- I had a hard time following - and be a bit less aggressive in CX - getting heated hurts your ethos.

So, first, I accepted the PRO's idea that actors need not be experts in both development assistance and military aid. (The US can choose from a variety of contractors, each specializing). The issue is that the PRO's impacts are contingent on them being effective without military aid alongside them. So the PRO really needs to talk about examples where developmental aid worked despite conflict + the CON needs to provide more evidence of where it failed. Since the CON's claim of contingency was never refuted, I have to go w/ them

Coleman

~~CRUZ, JUAN DE~~ LA

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: FD Kumar - Surendra v. CN Maitra - Gupta

Public Forum Debate	Juan De La Cruz (*CO)	
Round 3	COWDN 213	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Surenda	4 ~~15~~	1st	Gupta	3 ~~16~~
2nd	Kuma	2 ~~17~~	2nd	Maitra	1 ~~18~~

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Judge's Signature

Hired

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I really don't feel like the Aff responds to the corruption arguments very well. This really undercuts the whole case and leaves military assistance as the only effective assistance.

Lawrence

~~GUY, JOEL~~

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DS Fedasiuk - Wakefield v. CP Khelghati - Mobarhan

Public Forum Debate	Joel Guy (*AC)	
Round 3	LL 104	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st 3	Mobarhan	16	1st 2	Wakefield	17
2nd 4	Khelghati	16	2nd 1	Fedasiuk	17

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Judge's Signature

Harker

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

CX1

CX1 Don't let her eat up 34 secs explaining her 2nd contention. get a little flustered

CX2 You seem civil but I know you are getting frustrated.

CX2 Don't let him bully you. Good qs!

CX 3 Stay civil, Ryan. Exactly — Talk about probs, but not other things

Oral K

LINCOLN, LISA

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AA Shen - Ziaee v. CN Guo - Sun

Public Forum Debate	Lisa Lincoln (*FC)	
Round 3	LL 243	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	T. Ziaee 1	19	1st	Sun 4	18
2nd	J. Shen 3	19	2nd	Guo 2	19

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

L. Lincoln

Judge's Signature

Desert Academy

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This debate was dominated by the Aff. They had neg. on the defense from the first crossfire.

Sun/Guo - good debate but don't let them run over you. You got stuck on the one piece of evidence and that cost you the flow and you dropped points. It also got you flustered until you finally called them on it. [Both teams] Frameworks were close but not worth taking time on in this debate.

Ziaee/Shen - Really strong debaters but Shen came off so smug it was almost hard for me to give the ballot to Aff. I understand aggressive/assertive but you need some humility. Also you don't have good eye contact - need work on that (looking up instead). Ziaee - excellent!

The win came out of dropped points by the Aff and much stronger impacts by the Aff. Neg - get your cards in order.

Nice and then you go in for the kill. I like that technique.

DYER, MITCHELL **2014 ASU Southwest Championship**

PFD

FLIP: DZ Lala - Levitt v. DC McClure - Martin

Public Forum Debate	Mitchell Dyer (*DF)	
Round 3	LL 2	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)	
1st	Lala	1	19 ~~29~~	1st	McClure	4	16 ~~26~~	-30
2nd	Levitt	2	19 ~~29~~	2nd	Martin	3	17 ~~27~~	-60

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Judge's Signature

Mesquite/Bid Round Briefs

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg- You guys need to practice reading your case more. Was very slurred and poorly performed. Try to stand in one place during your speeches guys. Hands out of pockets, too.

Ethiopian conditions are probably more clandestine and comparable to the Sahel than Columbia, lol.

RFD: Aff was a lot more professional and prepared. Neg had some serious clarity issues. Aside from that, neg was very unresponsive, especially as the round progressed and the aff continually added more and more content. Neg's tenuous grasp of the round forces me to vote aff b/c they control all of the links and impacts. They prove that stability is key to combatting terr. and creating a bright future while military involvement only makes things worse. Neg also never proves why we need military involvement. Aff does a pretty dope job of explaining how great things are progressing.

MCCLURE, CHANISE

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AG Artigue - Ramaswamy v. DC Garrett - Andrade

Public Forum Debate	Chanise McClure (*AK)	
Round 3	LL 221	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	Garrett	4	18	1st	Ramaswamy	2	19
2nd	Andrade	3	19	2nd	Artigue	1	20

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

Bingham High School

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

ORAL

Newman, Ryan

~~MCCONAGHEY,~~ ELIZABETH

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: CN Ramesh - Wang v. CA Kelly - Labban

Public Forum Debate	Elizabeth McConaghey (*DH)	
Round 3	COWDN 218	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	labban	4	16	1st	Ramesh	3	18
2nd	kelly	1	20	2nd	wang	2	20

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Judge's Signature

Foothill High school

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The neg set the frame work for the debate and won based on their cases defensibility and evidence it's hard to argue conductive arguements that are also cogent Kelly had a great rebuttle where she gave 3 arguements and linked them to most of their case, but the evidence about the increase of developmental aid's effectiveness when militarr aid really turned the debate to the neg's side and put the debate within the perameters of their frame work, you should've argued their frame work more and to prove a cost benefit analysis would've been much better. Yes, that was in your first contention but you dropped it and made no effort to refute their frame work

CHANDRA, ARTHUR

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AO Ahooja - Isaacs v. AD Bai - Donovan

Public Forum Debate	Arthur Chandra (*DX)	
Round 3	LL 12	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	Bai	3	17	1st	Ahooja	2	18
2nd	Donovan	1	18	2nd	Isaacs	4	15

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

Redlands HS

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Comments given @ the end of Round

CALLAN, KRIS

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AC Ferdowsian - Fox v. CH Henriott - Wilde

Public Forum Debate	Kris Callan (*AD)	
Round 3	LL 248	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	Ferdowsian	(1)	16	1st	Henriotte	(4)	15
2nd	Fox	(3)	15	2nd	Wilde	(2)	15

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Kris Callan
Judge's Signature

Catalina Foothills *AD
School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro
STATUS Quo is Detrimental
Agriculture ISSUES
- Food Production, security
humanitarian "
Natural Disasters
Climate Changes
Impact on Human lives
- Food shortages (most lives lost)
- terrorism (small # of lives vs loss to famine)

- ABUSES of military AID
- food security is key to economic DEVELOPMENT.
- Famine 16 million people affected
- 300,000 child deaths /yr.

- corruption oversight improving
good point - need more evidence of how this is working.

Con
DEVELOPMENTAL AID incurs corruption - evidence?
can't track the money
prioritize military aid
- Combat terrorism
- arms trade
- Drugs
} evidence?

good point! { it is vital to stabilize an area before developmental aid can work.

no evidence { No profits to farmers
Farmers quitting
Govt would seize crops

Both sides made good points But Con had far less substantiating evidence to back up their contentions. Both sides didn't use all of their time effectively - this is reflected in speaker points.

SHETH, RAJAN

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: CN Su - Gilliam v. DC Jensen - Jernigan

Public Forum Debate	Rajan Sheth	
Round 3	LL 265	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	Su	1	19	1st	Jensen	3	18
2nd	Gilliam	4	17	2nd	Jernigan	2	19

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

ASU / student

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Security ~~causes~~ needed for dev aid to even be effective.

Reasons given orally

BERL, TK

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DT Lu - Liu v. CN Sethi - Chavda

Public Forum Debate	TK Berl (*CX)	
Round 3	LL 13	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	Chavda	4	15	1st	Jasmine Liu	1	16
2nd	Sethi	3	15	2nd	Stephanie Lu	2	16

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Judge's Signature

LAITS / PARENT / CONTRACT OFFICER

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF – POSITIVE OUTLAY OF FRAMEWORK AND WIN TIME LIMITS NEED TO WORK ON References and support. DO NOT CONCEDE 1st QUESTIONS IN GRAND ROUNDS – TOTALLY LOST CONTROL AND DIRECTION.

NEG – Extremely aggressive with FAR too many quotes ~~and to~~ SPREADING, RUDE INTERRUPTED AND REFERED TO PARTNERS CASE WITHOUT ADDRESSING QUESTION ASKED.

SLOW DOWN!! ANSWER QUESTIONS AS ASKED – INSTEAD OF defaming to partner,

THIS what not a clear win as the cases were not well developed on either side and the negative side bordered on abusive.

Negative – both extremely sharp capable debaters ill matched. IF AFF case would have held up better they would have won,

SCHULMAN, JAMI **2014 ASU Southwest Championship**

PFD

FLIP: DH Yang - Haider v. AD Shibano - Rubalcava

Public Forum Debate	Jami Schulman (*AG)	
Round 3	LL 103	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
3 1st	Yang	19	4 1st	Rubalcava	19
1 2nd	Haider	20	2 2nd	Shibano	19

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Yes

Judge's Signature

Chaparral / Student

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD:

I voted for the Aff for 3 reasons:

#1. According to Neg framework, Aff has to prove on balance (equal to or greater) that dev. aid ~~is~~ is preferred over military aid. Thus, I found that Aff said ~~dev aid is~~ lack of dev aid causes conflict which gets to root of problem

#2 Solvency
Neg won on long term impacts

#3 (Not really voting pt) Con present a bit of a cop out move by saying all Pro's evidence points to their side under their slightly abuse framework

Tips:

Better lines of questioning for 1st cx, please.
Shibano - great rebuttal but try to tone down a rhetoric a bit.

AFF

Ob. not mutually exclusive → balance of the two is needed so prioritization of one over the other is wrong

1. Economic and poverty increase agriculture 50% stable income 25% GDP in capital → Sudan and coup in Mali have been causing harm

2. Health infrastructure
- Malaria

3. Clinical transition Democracy
- stabilizes and promotes lasting peace
- economic development
- Hoover Institute: development

} Can fall within the neg

Cop-out rebuttal

1. Efficacy
- Military aid is effective
- Can't provide a plan

2. Solvency
- They don't show any long term solvency

CON

Ob. on balance

1. Must coexist → contradiction
- security is a precondition → lack of dev aid → is why conflict is there
- need to improve policies to install diplomacy and conflict resolution → increases terrorism → increases lives

2. Development aid can fail → 1. Est effectiveness 2. Solved through development 3. Increases human rights abuses
- benefit insiders
- no way to prevent money for something else
- more aid more corruption
- will benefit populous of unstable state

} Status Quo still gives problems

Providing a plan can't always prioritize

Solvency

Take on the AFF case and putting it on the CON.

CX I:
- Mutual exclusion principle
- of course, he'll say no to his point!
- agriculture

CX II
Kritique

Aff have to prove more dev. on balance

Not applicable in debate

Grand CX

Birthright citizenship

Direct voting

(4) ✓ Jun ~~NEWMAN, RYAN~~

(3) ✓

(4) ✓

(3) ✓

(2) ✓

(3) ✓

(2) ✓

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DT Bopardikar - Misra v. CC Hunt - DeNicola

Public Forum Debate	Ryan Newman (*CH)	
Round 3	LL 269	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	DeNicola	2	19	1st	Bopardikar	4	19
2nd	Hunt	1	20	2nd	Misra	3	19

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

HHS

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

< Affirmative >

- Malnutrition - Climate change adaptation
- Education - Health / mortality rates
- Self sustainability UNICEF stats (✓+)
- Police force

- Prioritize - importance
- Build schooling

- weapons is necessary
- lack of food → reason why terr.
- Peacekeepers → why are people desenting their homes if they're there inefficient
- Conflict will always be present, will always affect edu (✓+)

- Definition be clearer →

- Police force training satisfies prerequisite
- Medical training - long term
- Others have tech abilities to battle the chemical effects

< Negative >

- Military ↔ economy
- Displaced - 18 mil food shortage
- Peacekeeping

- Coup - overthrowing govt
- Terrorism is everywhere
- EU peacekeepers - inc → crop prod ↑

- Prerequisites → stability is necessary first → before developmental aid (✓+)
- Developmental aid → corruption of the govt
- Military force ≠ military aid
- conflict affects education
- Health aid ≠ developmental aid
  short term long term

- more important should come first

- Can't have edu w/o stability
- Conflict is the root cause of everything which AFF agreed to
- Weapons / chemical - can be in the US too, not unique

AFF	NEG
- Showed how much very grew	- Two definitions (based on importance)
- The prob is unique (chem)	- Never respond to "prerequisite"
- "Lake in the fishing pole"	- police force (AFF)
- Never addressed the police force →	- Dev. aid → more corruption
- Starvation	- No concrete stats - desertification from AFF
- Only evidence in Mali (displacement)	- Weapon use effects can be anywhere

Very tough round (VERY VERY)
Both sides did incredibly well; thank you for being respectful to eachother
AFF did a better job rebutting all of the points even though NEG had very good stances on rebutting as well
All the speakers were very powerful with their voices while explaining their stances.

Adam Buys
~~WOODS, SCOTT~~

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AK Faulao - Vendemiattti v. AC Lien - Srinivasan

Public Forum Debate	Scott Woods (*DH)	
Round 3	LL 45	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Elliot Lien (2)	19 (3)	1st	Gui Vendemiatti	18 (3)
2nd	Sneha Srinivasan (4)	18	2nd	Seilose Faulao	20 (1)

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? no

Adam Buys
Judge's Signature

I ndependent
School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

In this round ultimately framework became a non issue because both teams accepted their opponents framework, I found that pro had the more compelling long term impacts based on the assumption of stability however the con side showed the only way to achieve stability is through initial military aid, thus I vote con. For any questions thought of after the oral critiques feel free to email me at abuys@colgate.edu

ANDRADE, BECKY

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DT Bhatnagar - Wadhwa v. AX Thakar - Saha

Public Forum Debate	Becky Andrade (*DC)	
Round 3	LL 60	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	Wadwah	2	19	1st	Thaker	3	19
2nd	Bhatnager	1	19	2nd	Saha	4	20

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Y

B. Andrade

Judge's Signature

Perry Parent

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

You 2 were very good speakers. Everything (contentions) was easy to follow. The case of the ~~aff~~ neg. was interesting and I did appreciate how you always came back to your contentions. This round was fun to watch.

You all were very close in speaker points. I hated to rate you!

You both are amazing speakers.

Although I understood your argument I do not think you proved your case. The case would have been stronger with examples & why you think history would repeat itself in the modern world. ~~[illegible]~~

The argument (case) was interesting and thought proroking but as I reread the topic thoughtfully it did not work with me and the topic.

Yours very good
opinion. Everyone seems
to be ready to follow. The
case of the ex-king.
was unknowing and I
did appreciate that you
always came back to
your conversations. This
proved was for to make

you feel. as. imagining
problems.
Although I understand
your comment I do
not think you proved
your case. The case
would have been
stronger with examples.
Surely non-Hindu thinking
would indeed fall in the
modern world. This, thus,
[illegible]
The traditional view
intuition, and through
prophecy [illegible]
[illegible] topic [illegible]
I did not understand
the topic.

LEBEDA, ROBERT

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: CP Jagadish - Sridhar v. DX Ricksecker - Mandolang

Public Forum Debate	Robert lebeda (*DZ)	
Round 3	LL 113	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	Mandolang	4	16.5	1st	Jagheish	3	18.5
2nd	Ricksecker	1	14.5	2nd	Sridhar	2	19

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? V

Judge's Signature

Chandrade Speechcoach

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This was a great round

In regards to the "2032" card, it was wrong for the neg to say its shown no benefit. A better way to phrase it would have been no clear benefit. The card states 3.6 million got some sort of aid, but for all we know that means some people died and later only recieved one ~~[illegible]~~ meal. The card blantomly says humanitarian, which is not ~~[illegible]~~ development. The neg won the offs neg democracy contention. The off dropped much of the neg case, Peacekeeper and military coup. Looking at long term benefits development does not prevent droughts, as were brought up, since its ~~not~~ humanitarian the 3.6 million who were fed, not necessarily saved, do not count when weighing because of this the neg wins on the lives, and won most of the other arguments. So because of this the Neg wins

Tran

~~MCCLURE, DARYN~~

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AS Mills - Mills v. CC Knight - Shafstall

Public Forum Debate	Daryn McClure (*DC)	
Round 3	LL 102	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	David Mills	3	19	1st	Keith Knight	2	20
2nd	John Mills	4	19	2nd	Jack Shafstall	1	20

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Judge's Signature

Chandler High School

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

HOSSEINI, LEILA

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: FK Gilbert - Gowda v. DH Cohen - Kovalchuk

Public Forum Debate	Leila Hosseini (*AG)	
Round 3	SS 304	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
2nd 1st	Gilbert	2	20	1st 1st	Kovalchuk	4	~~19~~ 18
2nd	Gowda	1	20	2nd	Cohen	3	~~20~~ 19

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

Chaparral

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

You were all great speakers, I particularly enjoyed Gilbert and Gowda's clear, calm style.

Aff

C1 → Agriculture great long-term ev. humanity impact → not well refuted C1 stands

C2 → milit harmful / ↑ violence arque Mali is unique

C3: improve gov I don't buy taxes point but was not well refuted dropped interesting uranium/oil point

Neg - argued pro only used US examples but didnt explain why US was unique and couldnt crossapply

C1 → Terror + Drug milit is prereq for developement great argument but where are the numbers/empirical ev?

C2 → develop. ineffective "awful aid", quick and analogy → good pt but again I am looking for data

spoke mostly in hypotheticals and cited "general facts"

Ultimately, Aff proved that long-term development is better when aid is prioritized. Neg failed to prove that military aid is effective.

CROWN, JULIAN

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AX Brobst - Bedard v. DD Atkins - Atkins

Public Forum Debate	Julian Crown (*FK)	
Round 3	LL 107	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative	Rank	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Rank	Points (0-20)
1st	Bedard	2	17	1st	C Atkins	4	15
2nd	Brobst	1	17	2nd	L Atkins	3	16

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

Leland / Coach

School / Affiliation / Occupation

-60

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

They said that military aid is somewhat working if I recall correctly; I don't think they just said "yes" to "Is it working?"

Brobst. What do we currently prioritize? How can you say prioritize means "increase"? You need more resolutional analysis.

Bedard, chill out in grand cross fire.

Summary for Bedard could have been more case focused.

Sorry!

w

DANIEL, ALEX **2014 ASU Southwest Championship**

PFD

FLIP: AF Seo - Lawrence v. CA Nipper - Bogar

Public Forum Debate	Alex Daniel (*DT,AC)	
Round 3	LL 247	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	Nipper	4	16	1st	Lawrence	2	18
2nd	Bogar	3	16	2nd	Seo	1	18

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

Harker / School

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Nipper: Case needs more organization and you need substantially more eye contact and volume. BE CONFIDENT.

Lawrence: Good, but still more eye contact. Reading off the lap top was awk. in this space, but your case was clear, well-organized, and well-spoken

Bogar: Develop specific counters for contentions you expect to see. The opponent case was pretty shock, yet I could tell you were speaking off the cuff. Preparation breeds confidence.

Seo: Good rebuttal, but arguments need more description and analysis, I felt like I was hearing the surface, not the meat of your arguments.

Nipper: You only have two minutes, you have to launch into the speech and hit right away. Not enough substance and 0 impact calc.

Lawrence: Good grouping, decent argumentation, but still lacking proper impact calc. The strength was definitely your clash and ability to cover the whole round, the weakness was creating coherent voters.

BOGAR: Do not give a new definition in grand c-x

BOGAR: Framework was weird and muddled by both teams. Once again, more voters.

Seo: The framework debate was muddled and didn't get either team ground. The rest of the FF was good, more "why you'll vote for us."

RFD: Negative team is able to back up, empirically, their claim that counter-terrorism is necessary for long term stability. Affirmative lacks evidence and long term strategies, simply states benefits of developmental assistance.

BASSETT, STEVEN **2014 ASU Southwest Championship**

PFD

FLIP: FK Conklin - Dong v. DG Colvin - Okeefe

Public Forum Debate	Steven Bassett (*AG)	
Round 3	LL 47	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1	Conklin 1	19	2	Colvin 4	17
3	Dong 2	18	4	Okeefe 3	18

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Judge's Signature

Student

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Prep= 1:53

Prep= 1:22

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Oral Critique

RFD → Lack of causality on Neg.

Gave a response to
lack of a link

Martin
~~CHUNG, JAMES~~

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: CN Bhatti - Ramadoss v. CA Matteotti - Sweat

Public Forum Debate	James Chung (*DH)	
Round 3	COWDN 203	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	Ramadoss	3	18	1st	Sweat	2	18
2nd	Bhatti	1	18	2nd	Matteotti	4	17

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Judge's Signature

Perry HS

School / Affiliation / Occupation

45 ~~30~~

45 ~~35~~ ~~30~~

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Ramadoss:

Stop directing your partner during crossfire; that isn't your time to talk

Tone down the aggression

Cont 1) Vaccine

Cont 2) Social Dev.
- lack of education
- disease prevention
- refugee number ↑, showing need for

Sweat:

Be more aggressive in crossfire

Good use of sources & good speaking demeanor

Cont: Security
- Sec. begets dev.
- "Failed states"
  - can't balance sec. & dev

Cont 2: ~~Terrorism~~ Efficiency
- random acts of violence
- drug trade

Cont 3: Corruption

Bhatti

Monitor your use of "like"

Cont 1) Military aid increases terrorism
- education ↓ extremism

Cont 2) Humanitarian aid is dev. aid →
- Sudan: Military aid hindered dev. aid

How? This link was not developed enough

Matteotti:

Be more prepared; use all of your available time

Good redirecting in crossfire

Cont. 1) Military facilitates dev
- stable infrastructure

Corruption can undermine Dev. statistics

- Not focusing of US military aid
- Humanitarian aid isn't dev. aid
- US democratic corruption??
- ~~If you don't have evidence for this don't~~

Don't add this in, it is unrelated and won't help you

Very thorough argument and debunking of the opponents' contentions

Strengthen your use of sources and statistics, and utilize all of your available time. There ~~was~~ were good points offered but not strongly enough

McConaghy

~~MEYER, PAM~~

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DN Torpy - Apple v. AG Thorley - Mouti

Public Forum Debate	Pam Meyer (*DH)	
Round 3	LL 275	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative	Rank	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Rank	Points (0-20)
1st	Liam Torpy	1	20	1st	Elizabeth Thorley	3	16
2nd	Sydney Apple	2	20	2nd	Haytham Mouti	4	15

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

E McConaghy
Judge's Signature

BASIS Scottsdale, ~~Elizabeth~~ Director
School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This debate was clearly in the hands of the Aff team throughout. The aff team presented logical arguments, very organized, + lots of supporting evidence.

Liam main points: Food insecurity
micro financing
MA in the etre – malj
– prolong
– state of MA → ↑ terror

Elizabeth The con team had some good arguments in their opening, but it lacked organization, eye contact, succinctness in some points. Evidence was good at this time

The cross went clearly to the Aff team as the con couldn't support their stmts w/ evidence, didn't ask questions, + conceded points

Speaker 3, for the Con, did not have well organized thoughts or evidence. Difficult to follow.

Speaker 4, for the Aff, clearly stated the Aff's case, introduced new evidence to support it; contested con's arguments

Crossfire #2 was like Cross #1; concessions by CON, no questions by CON

Summaries + Final continued in same manner as above.

Aff team was the clear winner.

JERNIGAN, WADE

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DT Huang - Chona v. CN Ngo - Agarwal

Public Forum Debate	Wade Jernigan (*DC)	
Round 3	LL 274	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	Kripa Agarwal	3	17	1st	Joyce Huang	2	18
2nd	Hannah Ngo.	4	17	2nd	Eesha Chona	1	19

1.10 .45 1.20

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Twinos Alvarez
Judge's Signature

Chaparral HS - student
School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The neg was much better at extending their offense throughout the round & won off of terror & corruption. The Aff ended up defending themselves way too much & didn't focus on extending their own arguments enough. Solid round by both teams.

Seep

~~CONWAY, KYLIE~~

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DT Jagadeesh - Thirumalai v. CP Kikkeri - Taylor

Public Forum Debate	Kylie Conway	
Round 3	LL 105	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Ashwath Thirumalai (2)	17	1st	Rachel Taylor (4)	15
2nd	Suraj Jagadeesh (1)	20	2nd	Samika Kikkeri (3)	16

15

1:10

30

4/5

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Judge's Signature

Hanzai Seep - Frosh herder

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Augh: quit getting frustrated in Super Duper Crossfire, just move on. You won't convince if anything!

RFD: Cx must respond to the warrants in pro cards/analysis or. Continue to develop their args. throughout the rd.

ANDREATOS, KRISTIN

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AD Mazza - Russell v. DT Duraiswamy - Misra

Public Forum Debate	Kristin Andreatos (*AG)	
Round 3	SS 236	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	Russell	2	19	1st	Misra	3	19
2nd	Mazza	1	20	2nd	Duraiswamy	4	18

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Yes

Judge's Signature

Chaparral / teacher

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Russell: great speaker
could have been more clear in constructive

Mazza: well presented constructive - very strong counter pts
may want more statistics to compare terrorism in other regions
would like more evidence -> military aid causes the conflict

focus on ? & answer in cross

Misra: very clear constructive
be careful - no speeches during cross
good pt in final focus - also developmental aid in region

Duraiswamy: good job on bringing in corruption in constructive
good job on final focus - could have hit their evidence harder

focus on ? & answer in cross

SONI, RAJ **2014 ASU Southwest Championship**

PFD

FLIP: AG Kurtzman - Rowe v. CP Elzarka - Gutala

Public Forum Debate	Raj Soni (*DH)	
Round 3	SS 234	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	~~Rowe~~ Gutala	(1) 19	1st	Rowe	(4) 17
2nd	~~Kurt~~ Elzarka	(2) 18	2nd	Kurtzman	(3) 17

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

Basis Scottsdale / Parent / Physician

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro did good job making their points and pointing out the lack of evidence for Con's contentions. Pro Also seemed better prepared.

Bringing up the Northern Mali conflict would have been a good example for con.

Pro Spent a lot of time on female genital mutilation in argument so would have been better to have more information on the subject but statistics showing drop in practice were good.

Elzarka made excellent arguments that were very effective but spoke a little too fast.

Overall great job everyone & keep it up!

Chan

~~YANG, ROGER~~

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AO Sheets - DeSantis v. CC Goodman - McCollum

Public Forum Debate	Roger Yang (*DH)	
Round 3	LL 272	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	Sheets	1	20	1st	McCollum	4	17
2nd	De Santis	2	19	2nd	Goodman	3	17

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

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Disclosed. Under util framework, aff provided more concrete evidence

WAKEFIELD, AJ **2014 ASU Southwest Championship**

PFD

FLIP: DH Kim - Soni v. CN Han - Foster

Public Forum Debate	AJ Wakefield (*DS)	
Round 3	LL 249	Fri 01/10/14 02:00PM

Speaker	Affirmative		Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative		Points (0-20)
1st	Soni	4	20	1st	Han	3	20
2nd	Kim	1	20	2nd	Foster	2	20

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

Desert Vista

School / Affiliation / Occupation

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUND 1 or 2

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Oral K,+

Education would decrease terror, if the terrorists didn't blow up the schools first..

11