

PFD

FLIP: DG Colvin - Okeefe v. AS Mills - Mills

Public Forum Debate		Craig Skelton (*DN)	
Round 4		LL 221	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker Negative Points (0-20)
1st	Colvin	16	1st David 19
2nd	Okeefe	17	2nd John 18
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature	
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		Palo Verde School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? No			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Share CX,
both people
should be asking
questions.

use all
your prep +
speech time, aff.

I'm voting neg because
they proved that there is
no point to developmental
assistance without mil first.
You can't have a long term
solution if you aren't even
able to get the goods to
the people, because of
terrorism, instability, etc.

- David - awesome INR, totally
addressed everything

PFD

FLIP: AG Artigue - Ramaswamy v. CX Ahrens - Lathrop

Public Forum Debate			Alex Daniel (*DT,AC)		
Round 4			LL 265		Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Lathrop 4	18	1st	Ramaswamy 1	19
2nd	Ahrens 2	19	2nd	Artigue 3	19
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)			Harker / School School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Is this a low point win? _____					

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Lathrop:
 A little bit meek. I can tell you're shy.
 More eye contact and volume will make
 you appear more outgoing and confident.
 Case is solid, but lack of #s and empirics
 may come back to bite you.

Ramaswamy: You won't get away w/
 speaking that quickly with mom judges, but
 I thought you were clear. Good case, I agree w/
~~Lathrop's assertion that your case is not topical (for now)~~
 Great Oxford curve, nice. $\nearrow$ fixed, good job

Ahrens: Great coverage, but speaking style
 was shaky. Don't let yourself get distracted
 from organization. Make sure I always
 know exactly where you are on both sides
 of the flow. Good turns and obviously
 well-researched.

Artigue: Great flow coverage and
 tone. Extremely aggressive is perfect for
 rebuttal. Try to slow down for big issues
 and to summarize responses to a contention
 or sub-p. These summaries can serve as KO punches.

Lathrop: I didn't think counter-T
 and UN peace-keeping were good
 voters. I still don't know what I was
 supposed to vote off of, and your
 argumentation w/in was way too
 defensive $\rightarrow$ AFF NEEDS OFFENSE

Ramaswamy: Great summary argumentation
 and you picked great topics for voters.
 But you need to internally sign post better
 ex: "First voter, Second voter Third V..."

Ahrens: ~~okay~~ You picked really
 good voters, but you weren't
 giving me enough meat. I think you're
 a great debater, but I wanted
 more specifics.

Artigue: Flashing me an iPad screen
 w/ 12 pt. font when I know you didn't read
 it is gimmicky...
 No solvency - great argument
 you're a good debater ... no gimmicks, stick
 to debating

RFD: Negative provided better solvency with voters.

1. Agriculture: Aff claims that military aid hurts farmers but drops point until PF, Neg shows how assistance hurts overall market creating long-term problems. Market must succeed for this point to go to Aff or Neg, Neg does better to solve long term throughout round.

2. PKO: Neg shows how PKO's can help w/multiple cards. Aff does good job rebutting, but never is able to flow through their own solvency with dev. assistance and never responds to cards that go outside Holmman. Ultimately, Neg does more to convince me PKO's could help w/counter-T, so Aff does not flow through solvency b/c they do not provide empirics or show that dev. assistance can adequately solve poverty gap.

PFD

FLIP: CN Guo - Sun v. DT Jagadeesh - Thirumalai

Public Forum Debate			Pam Meyer (*DH)		
Round 4			LL 275		Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Thirumalai	(4) 18	1st	Sun	(1) 20
2nd	Jagadeesh	(2) 19	2nd	Guo	(3) 19
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? No					

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision: Both sides provided very strong cases, but I am giving the win to CON because they made a stronger case for the urgency of military stabilization prior to implementing Developmental Aid. To promote economic dev. + welfare

PRO Developmental aid is the priority over military aid

problems to solve w/ Dev Aid

- Drought / agriculture / food production water resources
- Education / reducing poverty / increase income
- 9 NGOs
- Mali example: 4,000 youth educated

- Terrorism - root cause is poverty

- Developmental aid

- increased GDP (EVEN DURING INSTABILITY)
- reduction in corruption
- " " terrorism

- military aid

- increases instability
- increases corruption
- 67% increase in terrorism

Priority - most urgent need

- hunger is priority
- DEV. AID (food + humanitarian aid)
- Terrorism increased by 500%

Mali has greater economic growth because the military aid secured the region so DEV. aid could work

DEV. AID - can't use this to reduce terrorism directly.

Education -

- not #1 priority
- food is priority
- need security to access food
- only 42% of food aid reaches intended recipients
- Not successful without military assistance
- military also provides developmental aid

PFD

FLIP: AG Kurtzman - Rowe v. DH Mitina - Chung

Public Forum Debate		Ryan Newman (*CH)	
Round 4		LL 247	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker Negative Points (0-20)
1st	<u>mitina</u>	<u>2</u> <u>20</u>	1st <u>Rowe</u> <u>3</u> <u>2</u>
2nd	<u>chung</u>	<u>1</u> <u>20</u>	2nd <u>Kurtzman</u> <u>4</u> <u>3</u>
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? _____		<u>East Hill High School</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The Neg team was extremely unprofessional he said "shit" more than once
 The Aff won on the floor could have been a great debate if one team cared the
~~slightest~~ slightest bit

DAVENPORT, GABI

M. Ippolito

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DC Jensen - Jernigan v. AD Mazza - Russell

Public Forum Debate		Gabi Davenport (*CC)	
Round 4		LL 10	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Jensen	17	1st
2nd	Jernigan	18	2nd
The winner of this debate was		Negative	
Affirmative		Negative	
(Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? No		Brody College Prep/Coach	
		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Didn't mind the speed but you may want to explain the warrants a bit clearer which may require you to slow down at times.

2nd: better signposting would help because I want to know where you're at on the flow

- good examples w/Mali

but the 'slippery slope' counter is not effective on their population growth famine

- solid summary, you did everything you needed to do

- pretty good summary but I don't but the cross application of Columbian violence to Sahel region

Liked the case and the observation but, just at first glance, it seemed some warrants were missing in contention 1 & contention 2 support A.

2nd: solid rebuttal; I got what marginal explanation means so you should have spent that time telling me why I should refer

- when listing your impacts, you should have focused on how/why (the warrants) rather than throwing out figs.

I love the impacts but I want the warrants... then don't attack that so I can't penalize you for that but it's a habit you should get into.

- very clear FF, well done

Decision PFD: Though I would have liked more explanation on the warrants by both sides, NEG gives me a sufficient one regarding developmental assistance & population growth that enables famine. I Negate because I buy the framework and then show how increasing aid reduces conflict while develop. asst. exacerbates conflict & famine for 16 million people. Not Aff can't counter w/disease impacts so I not negate.

DAVIS, NICK

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: CN Chew - Diyya v. AC Lien - Srinivasan

Public Forum Debate		Nick Davis			
Round 4		LL 147	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM		
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	<u>Chew</u>		1st		
2nd	<u>Diyya</u>		2nd		
The winner of this debate was					
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative			<u>Nick Davis</u>		
(Circle Winner)			Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? _____			<u>ASU</u>		
			School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

No show

PFD

FLIP: CH Poole - Brescia v. AS Freidman - Gummere

Public Forum Debate		Taylor Chen (*AD)	
Round 4		LL 243	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Gummere 1	18	1st
2nd	Freidman 2	18	2nd
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 ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.


Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF: Clear points, Be careful during cross X, can come off as being argumentative, did not understand why Algeria was relevant → minor issue overall like your point that Aid is not simply short term but for long term. Overall, strong performance. Quality of life and famine were key points.

Neg: Strong points regarding aid being wasted and corrupt governments, just unable to derail the humanitarian benefit of the AFF side. Good opening case made your points very easy to understand.

PFD

FLIP: AO Ahooja - Isaacs v. DK Ramos - Bathla

Public Forum Debate		Mitchell Dyer (*DF)	
Round 4		LL 264	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Ramos	4	1st
2nd	Bathla	3	2nd
		17	
		17	
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative <u>Negative</u>		 Judge's Signature	
(Circle Winner)		Mesquite/Bid Round Briefs	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.


Comments & Reason for Decision:

Not a bad round. Everyone needs to work on fluency, though

RFD: Solving the drought won't solve terrorism. Droughts fuel regional conflicts over resources (it was considered to be the tipping point for Darfur/Rwanda). From Barring that, neg solves for everything in the long term and military assistance links to necessity b/c it will pave the way the way for development assistance, so I negate.

PFD

FLIP: DF Ong - Silva v. AX Akella - Garg

Public Forum Debate			Rose Vail (*CN)		
Round 4			LL 262		Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Kim Ong 2	17	1st	Aakash Garg 1	18
2nd	Ben Silva 4	16	2nd	Prithva Akella 3	19
The winner of this debate was Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>			 Judge's Signature Hamilton School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirmative: Kim much improved good ref. & statistics
Ben needs better rebuttal

Negative: Aakash - lots of info very logical, but too loud. Kept raising voice.
Prithva - Fast but better at volume and clarity excel at cross fire.

PFD

FLIP: AH McGraw - Baca v. CH Jones - Turner

Public Forum Debate			Lisa Lincoln (*FC)		
Round 4			LL 230		Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Jones 2	18	1st	McGraw 4	17
2nd	Turner 1	19	2nd	Baca 3	17
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)			 Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			<u>Desert Academy</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Interesting debate-^{both} teams. I thought we were going to have a girl fight right in front of me. It made me really uncomfortable.
 - McGraw/Baca - Your case is interesting and could work with clear warrants. You got way too personal and combative with the other team. You ~~to~~ never said "2nd contention" when you read your case or did rebuttal and then called the other team stupid for not hearing that.
 - Jones/Turner - Good case. Don't get flustered when you get a counter plan case. They had a good idea, but weak case. Thanks for clear voters. When they got personal, just change the subject and don't get upset. Jones - you need to practice 1st speech so you don't stumble. When you have nothing more on their case (Turner), reiterate your points and focus on what they dropped.
- Decision: Aff. had more evidence & warrants. Neg. dropped aff. points and were abusive in cross-fire.

PFD

FLIP: FD Shah - Hu v. FO Flores - Lee

Public Forum Debate			Roger Yang (*DH)		
Round 4			LL 273		Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Lee	16	1st	Shah	11
2nd	Flores	20	2nd	Hu	15
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			 Judge's Signature <u>No Affiliation</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Lee - slow down, so you can actually speak clearly.

Flores - great speaker
great analysis

your opponent didn't really
Attack ~~at all~~ ^{up} ~~up~~
opponent for not attacking
up opponents.

Shah - you + good speaker,
work on analysis, your opponents
case and attack correctly.

Hu - have to work on attacking
opponents case.

- slow down before speaking,
- know your case.
- know your evidence.
- know what your talking about.

Shah - you need to be second
speaker.

Hu - you need to be first speaker.

PFD

FLIP: AD Rubin - Irfan v. CA Nipper - Bogar

Public Forum Debate		Becky Andrade (*DC)	
Round 4		LL 47	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Irfan (1)	18	1st
2nd	Rubin (3)	17	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		B. Andrade Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>N</u>		Perry - parent - self School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

good questions from Rubin

Summary - strong
Nice passionate ending.

Both sides
need to know -
when they wrap
up - what side
(neg or aff)
they are on...

need to pack more details
into contentions
need stats / more work
cited

never agree with
opposition

weak summary
need to know points
on be passionate

Need to go AFTER contentions one by one

Need to go AFTER contentions

short final focus -
Re focus on contentions
and why yours stand
and why theirs fall
short.

Matthew Nipper
Bogars
④ 10
② 17

Irvin
Rabin
①
②
8
17

B. Chabada

Parent - parent - self



Good questions from Rabin

Need state more work
Need to back more details
with contentions

last advice with opposition

Both sides
need to know
when they wrap
up - what side
(red or off?)
they are on...

Nice presentation making summary - strong


Weak summary
need to know point
on the presentation

Need to go after contentions and prepare need to do after contentions

Start first focus
no focus on contentions
and what points stand
and what points fall
short.

PFD

FLIP: DD Atkins - Atkins v. FK Conklin - Dong

Public Forum Debate		Elizabeth McConaghey (*DH)		Scott Woods	
Round 4		SS 304		Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Conklin 1	20	1st	C. Atkins 3	17
2nd	Dong 2	20	2nd	L. Atkins 4	17
The winner of this debate was			Judge's Signature		
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)			 School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Is this a low point win? AD			BASIS Scottsdale		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

C. Atkins - look at judge during Cross.

A. Conklin - Excellent questions in Cross...

L. Atkins - Quoting Forker, or anyone else's analysis, doesn't provide empirics. Some right wing editorialist who doesn't like AIDS says that AIDS is bad.

C. Dong - Excellent Cross -

Aff - Very strong case, well argued.
 1) 2.5 mill get food (or at least the equivalent of this, food for 2.5 million) is very strong. Con could have weakened this by showing that 2.5 mill lives weren't actually saved, just that the equivalent food was produced. Nevertheless, all the ag. dev. empirics go to show that it can work. Also, nice turn on the mosquito bed nets. malaria is down 49% - AIDS works.

2) AIDS linked to reducing corruption - very strong. Corruption as key obstacle to development - Aid → ↓ corruption.

Order →

3) mil. Assistance $\rightarrow$ $\uparrow$ violence $\uparrow$ instability
 $\&$ $\downarrow$ development. Very strong.

Con - ~~also~~ Argued that mil. assist. is necessary for development, but showed no link between mil. ass. & development.

Assented that aid doesn't work, but showed no evidence of where mil. Assist. $\rightarrow$ $\uparrow$ development - E.g. Afghanistan, Iraq, El Salvador, Colombia, Mali, Vietnam.


2) acts $\rightarrow$ black market - This was turned by showing 49% $\downarrow$ in malaria -
No reason to think that military assistance will reduce poverty.

Link not shown.

Argued for military intervention / regime change to bring about dem. gov'ts. This is not convincing.

PFD

FLIP: CN Ngo - Agarwal v. AJ Pulcifer - Asa

Public Forum Debate		Gabriel Miller (*AG)	
Round 4		LL 60	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Agarwal Asa	2 19	1st
2nd	Pulcifer	1 20	2nd
The winner of this debate was		Judge's Signature	
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? _____		Chapman HS School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Verbal Disclosure

Voting Points

- ① Spillover w/ Dev Aid Reduced
- ② Tech. Assistance skirts corruption

PFD

FLIP: DT Bopardikar - Misra v. DS Fedasiuk - Wakefield

Public Forum Debate			Phoebe Kuo		
Round 4			LL 241		Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Bopardikar 3	18	1st	Wakefield 2	18.5
2nd	Misra 1	20	2nd	Fedasiuk 4	19.5
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>			 Judge's Signature Manton Uren. School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

1:04.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1:20

2A is great, ~~it can~~ can go faster
 we language like "it concludes they are traumatic"

- should explore why Oswald turn
 doesn't matter more, about and to
 govt.

poor ex questions, clear answers though. on IN.

- good on impacts, now tell me about
 interactions.

Only arg on 2

good case, don't think you wrote it.

~~what's the point~~
 are try to make them look
 silly

Misra was extended clearly

→ also the reason of the Altman.

to ~~turn~~ co-opt the impact from the
 neg was good.

BASSETT, STEVEN

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DX Kirjwal - Aman v. CP Khelghati - Mobarhan

Public Forum Debate		Steven Bassett (*AG)			
Round 4	SS 314	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM			
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1	AMAR Kirjwal	4 18	1	Mobarhan	1 18
3	AMAR AMAR	2 19	4	Khelghati	3 19
The winner of this debate was			Judge's Signature		
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Oral

Critique

Prep: 2:00

RFD → Lack of concrete examples

Mooney
GUY, JOEL

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AG Thorley - Mouti v. CA Matteotti - Sweat

Public Forum Debate		Joel Guy (*AC)			
Round 4		LL 102	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM		
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Haytham Mouti	12	1st	Levi Sweat	16
2nd	Elizabeth Thorley	13	2nd	Paloma Matteotti	15
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 ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

ORAL

PFD

FLIP: AO Muddukrishna - Sharma v. DT Panja - Nakos

Public Forum Debate		Darius Ansari (*AG)	
Round 4		SS 236	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative (2nd)	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Sebi Nakos	2 19 2	1st
2nd	Maneesha Panja	3 19 4	2nd
The winner of this debate was		Points (0-20)	
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		1.30 1.15	
Is this a low point win? ☒ Yes		Judge's Signature School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This was a very close round but my decision ~~came~~ came down to the negative not sufficiently responding to the ~~neg~~ contention 3 about terror + blowback. Basically in order for the negative to win they had to prove that Military aid would provide the security necessary. Yet, they didn't refute the cards showing military aid leading to more conflicts + terror by the Aff. This meant that I couldn't really prefer the military aid & didn't have ~~much~~ much evidence to show me that mil aid would / is providing many security benefits.

PFD

FLIP: CO Bryant - Riggs v. FC Bacon - Colfax

Public Forum Debate				Julian Crown (*FK)			
Round 4				LL 12		Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Rank	Points (0-20)
1st	Bryant	3	16	1st	Colfax	4	16
2nd	Riggs	1	17	2nd	Bacon	2	16
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				 Leland Koach School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Interesting affirmative, I dig it!

However, I think you're power-tagging the African Dev. Bank card (or at least overblowing it).

Riggs you do an appeal to authority w/ dehumanism which I think is not super compelling. What's so in,

How is it that I'll never hear anything from the perspective of women if we prioritize MA, since you already have, in your case, stuff from the perspective of women? I see a lot of contradictions in your critical argument of a lack of strong solvency

HUSSAIN, SYED

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DX Lim - Tang v. CH Henriott - Wilde

Public Forum Debate		Syed Hussain (*DH)	
Round 4		LL 272	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Tang	19	1st
2nd	Lim	18	2nd
The winner of this debate was		Judge's Signature	
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 Basis Scottsdale/Parent/Physician School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

effective argument about 3.6 million people fed & 850K saved from acute malnutrition. unable to counter.
 OK to ask what UNICEF is but not an effective counter that you don't know what it is. could have emphasized that resolution implies that we are choosing how to spend tax dollars so there are organizations like UNICEF who can use donations but only the government can provide military aid.

why build a house in burning area - better argument than training troops to rebel against their own government.

effective argument stating pro position on military intervention example by focussing/clarifying military aid. rebuttal argument about anti-american sentiment.

good to include education as form of developmental assistance.

PFD

FLIP: DT Sahoo - Papakipos v. CS Thomas - Friend

Public Forum Debate		Robert lebeda (*DZ)	
Round 4		LL 145	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Papakipos	1 18.8	1st
2nd	Sahoo	2 18.5	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? _____		Chamirade Speech School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The aff won because they won the arguments about medicine aid. The neg did not have much concrete evidence. The aff won terrorism argument by showing the decrease terrorism better than neg, and terrorism became the focal point in the debate.

The neg dropped much of its case.

Great round! Good job!

PFD

FLIP: DT Duraiswamy - Misra v. AA Shen - Ziaee

Public Forum Debate			Alvin Chan (*DO)		
Round 4			LL 14		Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Ziaee	4	1st	Misra	3
		19			19
2nd	Shen	2	2nd	Duraiswamy	1
		20			20
The winner of this debate was Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____			 Judge's Signature Pat Verde High School School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Disclosed

PFD

FLIP: AS Pierre - Draper v. AK Faulao - Vendemiatti

Public Forum Debate		Tiffany Tibbetts (*FG)			
Round 4		LL 148	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM		
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Vendemiatti	20	1st	Pierre	19.5
2nd	Faulao	19.5	2nd	Draper	19.5
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
(Circle Winner) Affirmative Negative Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			GCA School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Vendemiatti - read faster so you can get your whole case in in 4 min.

Faulao - be aware that when you get impassioned, your volume raises

Pierre - watch your "likes" and "ums"

Great Debate

Both teams made valid arguments for their side. I wish I could say it was a tie. I have to vote Pro. I would have voted Con after their Final focus, but the Pro convinced me in their final focus that if we prioritize Dev. aid over military aid instead of trying to do both, that the issue of the peace keepers' safety would be solved. It was the point about the peace keepers' safety that was swaying me towards the Neg, so once the pro defeated that I had to switch sides. Great job to both teams.

ARADHYULA, Satheesh

PFD

FLIP: DC Garrett - Andrade v. AO Sheets - DeSantis

Public Forum Debate			Jami Schulman (*AG)		
Round 4			LL 103		Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Garrett 4	18.5	1st	Sheets 1	20
2nd	Andrade 2	20	2nd	DeSantis 3	19
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u> Yes			Satheesh Aradhyula Judge's Signature Catalina Foothills HS. School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- put forth
- * Both teams did very well. ^{well articulated argument, debated well.}
 - * Well prepared cases and delivered well.
 - * Pro side wins disease control argument and that sustained disease reduction leads to long run economic development.
 - * Pro side ^{won} ~~con side~~ structured adjustment loan argument. Con side did not counter this point well.
 - * ~~Con side~~ France/Uranium point is a wash.
 - * Con side argued that corrupt governments do not allow DA to reach intended people - a valid point. However pro side's argument that DA can be given directly to people, by passing govts. Pro side won this point.

#

PFD

FLIP: CN Maitra - Gupta v. FO Bach - Chung

Public Forum Debate			Nicholas Petsas (*AS)		
Round 4			LL 248		Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Chung	3	1st	Gupta	1
		18			20
2nd	Bach	4	2nd	Maitra	2
		15			18
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 ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1:41 Prep for a 2 min speech?
 have a better use of time.

RFD: The Pro wins the debate because they proved that
~~the~~ retaliation can occur to more than just US troops which mitigated
 the Con's ^{only} winning argument that U.S. AID has been hampered by lack of
 security providing even more ground to the Pro's claim that Education
 & Econ growth can reduce terrorism.

PFD

FLIP: CN Han - Foster v. DX Ricksecker - Mandolang

Public Forum Debate		Matthew Brandstetter (*FO,DT)	
Round 4		LL 149	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	RANKS Points (0-20)	Speaker Negative RANKS Points (0-20)
1st	MANDOLANG	4 15	1st HAN 3 16
2nd	RICKSECKER	2 17	2nd FOSTER 1 17
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative Negative		Matthew F Brandstetter	
(Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? NO		FO	
		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD:

Negative evidence from Champion Briefs states that DA cannot be given w/o military aid concomitantly - Trumps Aff claim that DA must come first before military aid.

This ultimately wins round for Neg

Other drops by Aff only made this decision easier.

AFF: Ending hunger claim by 2032 is somewhat of a stretch given the evidence as it is written.

NEG: Read complete citation w/ evidence 😊

(4)✓ CRUZ, JUAN DE LA Jun

(3)✓ Tracy Palmer

(4)✓

(3)✓

(2)✓

(3)✓

(2)

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DT Lam - Raghiv v. DH Lee - Lee

Public Forum Debate		Juan De La Cruz (*CO)			
Round 4		COWDN 215	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM		
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Haley Lee	① 20	1st	Emaad Raghiv	④ 17
2nd	Stanley Lee	② 18	2nd	Alexander Lam	③ 17
The winner of this debate was			Tracy Palmer		
Affirmative Negative			Judge's Signature		
(Circle Winner)			Fairmont Prep		
Is this a low point win? NO			School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirmative

Negative

- Not mutually exclusive
- Econ benefits
- Improve Quality of life
- Health Infrastructure (malaria)
- Political transitions; Sustainability
- more people die in democracy

- Terrorism - increased 550%
- Drug trafficking
- Military coups - eliminate the chance of dev aid from occurring

- Military aid makes extremism ↑
- Developmental aid ↔ military aid helps
- Prioritize building own econ first
- NEG evidence is not effective (coups)
- Nothing to do with military aid long run effect

- Micro. doesn't affect poverty
- No edu ^{to figure out} no long term
- Malaria
- Not resolutional - not dev aid
- Profit goes to terrorism

- Priority - long term; short term importance too
- No actual definition of dev aid (V+)
- Why long term? Stay alive (ultimate goal)
- false dichotomy

- Imminent threat & security
- Dec likelihood of coups/war/violence
- malaria ↑ 12%
- Nig police force burned drug...

AFF had more concrete evidence/logical reasoning while stating/rebutting points
NEG - heavily focused on few topics/not as diverse points

BUYS
WOODS, SCOTT push

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DC McClure - Martin v. CN Su - Gilliam

Public Forum Debate		Scott Woods (PH) Adam Buys	
Round 4		LL 274	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker Negative Points (0-20)
1st	McClure	17	1st Su 19
2nd	Martin	18	2nd Gilliam 18
The winner of this debate was Affirmative ☒ Negative (Circle Winner)		Adam Buys Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? NO		Independent School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Ultimately I vote con because all pro imports are dependent upon the stability promoted by the military and of con. Oral critiques were provided if any further questions but feel free to email me at abuys@colgate.edu

PFD

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

Public Forum Debate			Leila Hosseini (*AG)		
Round 4			LL 43		Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Gutala	4	1st	Bedard	1
2nd	Elzarka	3	2nd	Brobst	2
The winner of this debate was			L. K. H.		
Affirmative Negative			Judge's Signature		
(Circle Winner)			Chapara		
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

agreed/ neg's def of prioritization + longterm effectiveness

NEG

CI stability

prereq

fuel supports terror

expand reach

→ countered w/

↑ #terror rate/ratio

AFF

Famine/Poverty/Dams

→ don't prove large scale, long-term effectiveness

women's rights

FGM vs. sexual violence

Ultimately, I chose Neg because they showed that development aid without military aid coming first is often ineffective, damaging or not effective as it could be. Neither side proved solvency but the Neg proved more solvency and showed that aff side can actually damage solvency.

Loved CX, great clash, all excellent speakers—

PFD

FLIP: AD Ackerley - Chen v. DH Kim - Soni

Public Forum Debate		Chanise McClure (*AK)	
Round 4		LL 2	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Soni 3	19	1st Chen 4
2nd	Kim 1	20	2nd Ackerley 2
The winner of this debate was		Judge's Signature	
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 Bingham	
Is this a low point win? _____		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

they show under the affirmative
 that under both definitions they
 fix diseases, education, decreasing
 crime by 14% every grade level.
 They show it doesn't have to go
 through the government but they
 can still solve for stability.

PFD

FLIP: AD Relich - Aradhyula v. DX Jung - Frehner

Public Forum Debate			Broderick Krager (*AJ)		
Round 4			LL 114		Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
1 Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	2 Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Jung	4	1st	Aradhyula	3
2nd	Frehner	1	2nd	Relich	2
The winner of this debate was			Judge's Signature		
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)			Sunnyslope		
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>			School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Jung - Good use of speed, but slow down on numbers. Nice defence on the use of somalia, etc, but in the end, you won't be able to use somalia. Sorry! Calm down in Summary, and talk about my key voters.

Aradhyula - Great case. Your C2 subpoint C needs a link. Why would military aid have helped chad specifically? You can't just make that claim w/o backing it up. You need better deterrence evidence. I get it, but 7/11. We had more firepower, but they still attacked.

Frehner - Good points in rebuttal. Drive home the 2000% agriculture to counter their econ points! They have \$568 bil against you!

Great final focus. You really cleared up all the canons of terror and how military aid doesn't work against it.

Relich - You attacked everything, but your attacks were subpar. you just pointed out logical fallacies (I buy their radios = ↓ terror because radio is increased influence, and just like conservative stations in the US) but you had no counter evidence.

RFD - starvation - pro wins. Yes, 14 sources say it's ineffective, and yes, military aid does nothing for starvation. But the only impact I have is the 2000% agriculture. I have to buy it.

stability - pro wins - can is talking about giving guns to both terror and government groups. You can't ~~can't~~ CAN'T give guns to terrorists.

econ - can win - \$568 bil is not worth 2000% increase in economy.

PFD

FLIP: FC Kelehan - Miller v. DH Meyer - Sikora

Public Forum Debate		Brandon Garrett (*CP)	
Round 4		LL 240	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	<u>Catie Sikora</u> <u>2</u>	<u>17.5</u>	1st
2nd	<u>Victoria Meyer</u> <u>1</u>	<u>18</u>	2nd
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		 Judge's Signature <u>Presentation HS</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

IN ROUND

PFD

FLIP: AX Thakar - Saha v. DT Huang - Chona

Public Forum Debate			Vincent Nguyen (*AG)		
Round 4			COWDN 218		Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
4 1st	Saha	19	1st 3	Huang	19
2nd	Thakar	17	2nd 1	Chona	17
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)			Judge's Signature Chaparral / Student School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Is this a low point win? <u>Yes</u>					

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD:

Neg. b/c most impacts of Aff cannot be put in place if there is no security. Neg wins on showing that military assistance allows education to be put in place. Aff now presented an adequate response. The overpopulation point was dropped by Neg but so was the point that military is detrimental for war by Aff. HIV argument was not good for both sides.

Tips:

Don't get caught up on contraceptives in the Grand CX. There is so much more to discuss. I find it extremely unlikely contraceptives increase HIV. It doesn't matter whether or not people use them, it's access that is important. For ex) it's more important people have access to rights than whether they personally choose to exercise the rights.

AFF

1. Climate change
2. Population growth

1. Family health

- STD, contraceptives 97% STD → access increases freedom
- Family planning; human rights
- Cures overpopulation
- Reduces infantile/maternal

2. Increase social stability

- central to agriculture crop yields

1. HIV
2. education
3. decreasing mortality

involvement in community

20,000
2 million's
greatest # in
round

Fake pills

Contraceptives are fake

12% did not have access

Using contraceptives increases risk for HIV

HIV not topical to Sahel

No security then no education

Health programs impossible w/o military aid

75% agricultural programs failing

equally prioritized default

Military aid is exacerbating problems

Recurrence in HIV

200,000 deaths prevented

1. Fosters corruption
2. HIV
3. Education long term
4. overpopulation
5. 200,000 deaths

NEG

1. If both are equally prioritized
2. Judges default

1. Military aid

- A. Corrupt regimes
 - dictators in power
 - no incentive for independence
- B. terrorism
 - 58% since developmental
 - 32% decrease

Social stability vs. government

non unique for military aid

didn't show link how it decreased terrorism

2. Drug Trafficking

- 25% cocaine through Africa
- terrorism domino effect

→ cocaine not specific to Sahel

→ no link

→ humanitarian

3. Peace Keeping

- development futile until stability restored
- 6.5% increase in crop production → decrease poverty

→ social stability is a prereq

→

- Acts as a conflict deterrent

1. Prereq

2. Both are prereq

3. WASH

Contraceptives

Not topical to Sahel

Security is prereq

helps growth

75% programs fail

Nothing can be done w/o security first

32% decrease in

6 and cross terrorism

Humanitarian is not under developmental

Military is the prequisite 2x in HIV

80% staff fleeing

How many use contraceptives access

OXI

- Different types of aid
- contraceptives
- How can contraceptives be harmful...
- Drug trade

CK II

Prereq

Don't get caught up in contraceptives

Lagigia
AYEN, KEITH

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

No Show

PFD


Win by default


FLIP: CC Hunt - DeNicola v. FK Niu - Nagarajan

Public Forum Debate					
Round 4		COWDN 213		Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	_____	_____	1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____	2nd	_____	_____
The winner of this debate was					
Affirmative Negative					
(Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? _____					
			Kathryn Lagigia Judge's Signature		
			ON School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:





Chris Guy

PFD

FLIP: DN Torpy - Apple v. CN Rudrapatna - Phan

Public Forum Debate		James Chung (*DH)			
Round 4		COWDN 203	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM		
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Torpy	218	1st	Rudrapatna	316
2nd	Apple	118	2nd	Phan	416
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)			J. Chris Guy Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			Chandler Pops / Warlock School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg case lacked direction when insisting on military aid. There was no logical extension. The case was muddled.

The Aff case was well supported and their logic extended well. They did a good job of opening huge holes in Neg Case

All speakers were skilled but the Neg speakers lacked ammo.

PALMER, TRACY

Andreatos, Kristin

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: CN Sethi - Chavda v. DT Xie - Bashar

Public Forum Debate			Tracy Palmer (*FO)		
Round 4			SS 234		Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Bashar	2	1st	Chavda	3
		19			18
2nd	Xie	1	2nd	Seth	4
		19			17
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)			Judge's Signature Tracy Palmer		
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			School / Affiliation / Occupation Park North Prep Chaparral		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Bashar: strong on cross
 2nd contention - strongest
 great summary in final focus

Xie: strong statistics in constructive → ↑ terrorism w/ introduction of foreign troops
 good specific example → Mali
 be careful w/ cross → no speeches, just ? & answer

do not need to argue that no military aid is needed
 very strong in grand cross

Chavda: make sure to prepare for any & all ?s w/ evidence
 very clear constructive

Seth: constructive could be a little confusing
 some good ?s on cross - could be more ~~forceful~~
 good summary & emphasis on final focus

do practice cross - quick ? & answer
 do never talked about corruption with specifics

PFD

FLIP: AO Curtis - DeTaboada v. AG Schulman - Nguyen

Public Forum Debate		Matt Anderson (*CA)	
Round 4		LL 45	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Nguyen	1	1st
2nd	Schulman	4	2nd
		18	
		16	
The winner of this debate was		Negative	
Affirmative		Negative	
(Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		Red Mountain	
		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.


Comments & Reason for Decision:



Ultimately the debate came down to developmental aid & military aid being needed at the same time to be effective, which under the negative's ^(undisputed) framework meant that they won the round. Aff wasn't able to show how developmental aid could be successful on its own, with negative's evidence/impacts directly proving that in many areas it couldn't.

PFD

FLIP: AG Blecker - Blecker v. DH Yang - Haider

Public Forum Debate		Simone Saldana (*AH)	
Round 4		LL 271	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative AG	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	4 Blecker, D.	15	1st Yang
2nd	3 Blecker, A.	16	2nd Haider
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature Carter School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? NO			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

First speaker delivery was really good. Spoke clear. Evidence was really good. Cross examination was good. Some of the questions that the other side asked, you could not answer - need to prepare a little bit more. Grand Crossfire was good.

Second speaker did a really great job. Delivery was good, spoke very clear. Evidence was very good. Cross examination was very good! Grand Crossfire was really good.

First speaker great job on delivery of your speech! Evidence was very good & clear. Cross examination was really good. Questions were good that were asked & answered. Great job on the grand Crossfire.

Second speaker did a very good job on delivery of his speech. Evidence was really good. Cross examination was excellent. Grand Crossfire was excellent.

I chose the negative side because I thought that they proved their side better, their case & evidence was stronger than the affirmative side.

PFD

FLIP: CN Ramesh - Wang v. DZ Tennakoon - Grewal

Public Forum Debate		Jonathan Garza	
Round 4		LL 270	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker Negative Points (0-20)
1st	Ramesh	4	1st Tennakoon 1
		14	
2nd	Wang	3	2nd Grewal 2
		15	
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative <u>Negative</u>		Judge's Signature	
(Circle Winner)		Independent	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Ramesh, work on your enunciation.
- Off time roadmaps are silly.

- Tennakoon, you should calm down in CX.
- Grewal, don't be so sassy about things
- Also spent too much time on framework in Final Focus.

- The back and forth on evidence exchanges is kind of silly.

RFD: Looking at the solvency framework both sides agreed to, neg provided clear solvency. This was also the only clean piece of offensive coming off of either side.

PFD

FLIP: CN Guo - Sadler v. DO Baduria - Spada

Public Forum Debate			Dennis Karjala (*CS)		
Round 4			LL 268		Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Sadler 2	17	1st	Baduria 3	16
2nd	Guo 1	18	2nd	Spada 4	15
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____			Dennis S. Karjala Judge's Signature Basis Flagstaff School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I gave extensive comment to the competitor after the debate. Both sides tried to hang too much weight on the definition of "priority" because ultimately that cannot be a deciding substantive factor, as opposed to a debating "trick". Negative side needs some plausible examples of how a limited military assistance program has, or at least could, work, recognizing that military assistance has been increased in the past. Aff side did a good job here of recognizing past aid failures and specifying a different approach - while admitting that social order could together with aid be assisted by some military assistance.

PFD

FLIP: CC Goodman - McCollum v. FD Kumar - Surendra

Public Forum Debate		Jeffrey Kuperman (*AO)	
Round 4		LL 263	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Kumar	_____	1st
2nd	Surendra	_____	2nd
The winner of this debate was		Goodman McCollum No Show	
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		Jeffrey Kuperman Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? _____		Carlsbad HS School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PFD

FLIP: DD Karbo - Dupree v. AD Bai - Donovan

Public Forum Debate		Rajan Sheth	
Round 4		LL 249	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Bai 4	18	1st Dupree 2
2nd	Donovan 1	20	2nd Karbo 3
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 ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.


Comments & Reason for Decision:

Security needed to stop terrorism.

Reasons given orally

PFD

FLIP: DF Goulet - Bua v. CP Ramprasad - Heylman

Public Forum Debate		AJ Wakefield (*DS)	
Round 4		LL 160	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Heylman	120	1st
2nd	Ramprasad	418	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒			
(Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		<u>Desert Vista</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Ramprasad, CX is ~~not a monologue~~ for questions, not monologues!!

Aff brought new evidence in ~~Re~~ during final focus!!

Neg provided the most solvency, but their definition of prioritize tells me I have "arrange in order of importance."

Too bad that argument was dropped after cases, so their claim that neither ^(or both) ~~are~~ should be prioritized first flows.

1P PFD 2C
FLIP: DZ Lala - Levitt v. DA Almanza - Raso

Public Forum Debate		Joel Underwood (*DD)	
Round 4		LL 150	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Lala	19	1st
2nd	Levitt	18	2nd
DZ Lala - Levitt		DA - Almanza Raso	
The winner of this debate was		Judge's Signature	
Affirmative Negative		J. Underwood	
(Circle Winner)		DD	
Is this a low point win? _____		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Underwood @seattleacademy.org (flow mailed upon request)

Con is basically putting all the eggs in a single cause/effect basket: 'Neo-liberalism'.

"You keep using that word. I do not think it means what you think it means..." - Inigo Montoya

Say too much ventriloquism going on. Shouldn't be telling her what to say during XF and REALLY shouldn't be telling her what to say during speeches.

Pro: Got pulled off case in a big way. Stay on target. I heard about Cost/Benefit at the VERY beginning and the VERY end.

PFD

FLIP: DT Bhatnagar - Wadhwa v. CP Saraf - Allen

Public Forum Debate			Arthur Chandra (*DX)		
Round 4			LL 113		Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Saraf 2	18	1st	Wadhwa 3	17
2nd	Allen 1	19	2nd	Bhatnagar 4	17
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)			 Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>			<u>Redlands HS</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Comments given @ the end of the round

BERL, TK

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AC Ferdowsian - Fox v AF Seo - Lawrence

Win

Public Forum Debate		TK Berl (*CX)	
Round 4		LL 108	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st			Negative
2nd			Points (0-20)
The winner of this debate was AF SEO - LAWRENCE Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____		J. U. Berl Judge's Signature LAHS / PARENT / CONTRACT OFFICER School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

SEO - Lawrence AF Appeared

AC - Ferdowsian
Fox

No
Show

@ 4:52 pm.
TK Berl

PFD

FLIP: CC Knight - Shafstall v. CN Bhatti - Ramadoss

Public Forum Debate		David Barclay (*DK)	
Round 4		LL 106	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	<u>Knight</u>	_____	Negative
2nd	<u>Shafstall</u>	_____	Points (0-20)
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? _____		<u>Brophy</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Forfeit

~~Forfeit~~

~~Forfeit~~

PFD

FLIP: CP Jagadish - Sridhar v. DS Carlton - Schieke

Public Forum Debate		Alyssa Martin	
Round 4		LL 109	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Schieke	3	1st
2nd	Carlton	1	2nd
The winner of this debate was		Points (0-20)	
Affirmative		Negative	
(Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? ☒		Perry HS	
		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

(Please have all tech. prepared beforehand)

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Schieke:

Cont 1 Corruption

- cause & con. of weak gov
- strains society

Foreign aid ↑ leads ↓ corruption

Cont 2 Education

- 1 year school ↑ = 10% income
- child labor

Cont 3 Slavery

- slaves cannot purchase freedom

Carlton:

Cont 1: Dev. prevents instability

- adding Military ↑ violence

so - Mali Coup started by trained indiv.

- human rights abuse

Cont 2: Senegal Peace is not due to military

South Sudan not included

Jagadish:

Cont 1) Stability

- military coups
- Senegal = ↑ stability w/ military aid

Cont 2) Peacekeepers

- refugee services

TSTCP

slow down slightly

Sridhar

Cont 1) Security & Stability beget dev.

- dev. is ineffective w/o ↑

Cont 2) Peacekeepers

- saved 200,000 from relocation
- military stops illegal activities

Cont 3) Education

- 30% increase in Unemp.
- child labor being addressed by military

Strong use of sources and clear linkages, try to show that dev. aid would be able to come help the area, and then leave w/o the area falling apart. Had you shown that aid had/could produce(d) a self-sustaining stability you would have won.

The peacekeepers argument could have been further developed. You won because military aid was shown to be the backbone of stability, and b/c the other team did not show the dev. aid alone was enough.

PFD

FLIP: CP Waters - Elzarka v. DZ Warburton - Wong

Public Forum Debate		Kylie Conway	
Round 4		LL 107	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	<u>Cole Warburton</u> <u>4</u>	<u>15</u>	1st
2nd	<u>Jacob Wong</u> <u>3</u>	<u>17</u>	2nd
			Negative
			Points (0-20)
			1st
			<u>Amy Elzarka</u> <u>2</u>
			2nd
			<u>Anna Waters</u> <u>1</u>
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative <u>Negative</u>		 Judge's Signature	
(Circle Winner)		ASU	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Verbal RFD

PFD

FLIP: DT Lu - Liu v. AD Shibano - Rubalcava

Public Forum Debate			Natasha Iyer (*AX)		
Round 4			LL 105		Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Liu 2	18	1st	Rubalcava 4	15
2nd	Lu 3	18	2nd	Shibano 1	18
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			 Judge's Signature St. Francis School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Crossfire is being wasted. Don't debate in CF; GET CONCESSIONS.

Both of you are speaking quickly but saying very little. WORD ECONOMY
 (on the flow)

Need to cover better in
 CON summary

CON was winning the debate.
 Had proper extensions been
~~made~~ made, should have.

Why aren't you responding
 to their TURN???

Why?? No, actually, why?

don't want
 to vote
 PRO, but
 because of
 this, I sort
 of have
 to.

(but also,
 you should have
 mentioned the thing
 in mali; they relied on that)

BUZAN, ANGELA

MCCLURE, DARYN

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: CA Kelly - Labban v. AK Russell - Ferguson

Public Forum Debate		Daryn McClure (*DC)	
Round 4		LL 104	Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Speaker	Negative
1st ② Ferguson	Points (0-20) 19	1st ④ Labban	Points (0-20) 16
2nd ③ Russell	Points 18	2nd ① Kelly	Points 20
The winner of this debate was		Angela Buzan Judge's Signature	
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		Perry HS School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

[Labban] - I can barely hear you
don't mumble
1 minute of definitions
ineffective

- ① defends Sahel & others - Terrorism
proximity to conflicted territories. set up govt
- ② ~~Individual rights~~ nuclear
Military preparation

Print out your cases and speeches.
You should be able to provide
the article for review upon request.

[Kelly] OK
re: underdevelopment
military is more effective
re: landmines
for dev. aid not military
How so?
You are a strong speaker, but
don't use circular reasoning.
How is mental health a service
provided by the military?
your attack on their 3rd contention
failed.
Online legal dictionary

- [Ferguson] AFF
Dev. assistance first
root causes
① Center for dev. Develop first
employment, education
quote
Military boost terrorist recruitment
- ② Landmines / Lives
Destructive pre-existing
85-200m. mines
70 deaths/day primarily children
more deaths than any other
- ③ AIDS - clarify "HIV/AIDS"
60% deaths of military

What's your tagline?

[Russell] B
Terrorism b/c lack of options
Prioritization
Move your definitions into the A Speed
re: AIDS (say HIV/AIDS & family planning
not "safe sex")

22/used
30
32
10

Don't feed your partner points; it makes her look weak.

not mentioned in Summary

PFD

FLIP: DH Cohen - Kovalchuk v. CP Kikkeri - Taylor

Public Forum Debate				Jonathan MacMillan (*AA)							
Round 4				LL 13		Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM					
Speaker		Affirmative		Points (0-20)		Speaker		Negative		Points (0-20)	
1st		Taylor		2		1st		Kovalchuk		4	
2nd		Kikkeri		1		2nd		Cohen		3	
The winner of this debate was						Jonathan MacMillan Judge's Signature Dougherty Valley HS Coach/Teacher School / Affiliation / Occupation					
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)											
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>											

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision: Aff wins on dropped human growth contention.

Kovalchuk	Taylor	Cohen	Kikkeri
DA=MA or MA>DA I. a. weak governance must be corrected - France's MA in Mali b. MA is pre-req to development - security is key to E.D. II. DA is currently ineffective	DA=Aid spent to promote dev. goal of aid is to solve I. Rapid population growth → more food instability • ↑ in family planning → ↓ fam size DA, no MA offers solvency	→ Concede → DA w/o MA is like a house on quicksand → DA promotes dependency → More investment in country after security is established	a. → DA is a solvency for drug trafficking - Nigeria, Sahel region b. → DA attacks root cause of problem - terrorists, traffickers II. → DA effective MA was not necessary in Mali MA is short term
• Military Intervention & training as well • Need a secure govt first before solving problems • Long Term Solvency	• DA helps with food shortages, by addressing family planning • DA lowers instability • MA causes anti-US sentiment	Voters Quality of Life Lives Economy	Voters • DA attacks root causes - overpopulation, terror • Lack of citations, warrants to support claims • No response to human growth

PFD

FLIP: FK Gilbert - Gowda v. FO Palmer - Kim

Public Forum Debate			Hannah Shoell (*DA)		
Round 4			LL 269		Fri 01/10/14 04:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Gilbert [2]	19.5	1st	Kim [3]	19
2nd	Gowda [1]	20	2nd	Palmer [4]	18.5
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)			Sanantha Hauser Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			Palo Verde HS School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Really close debate.

I'm voting Aff because I believe their impacts outweigh and are more empirically proven. Had the Neg extended the drug trade arg, it would have given them a slight edge in impacts. The locust problem is interesting, but
 ① It's not clear the actual results of it or how likely it is to happen again and ② there's nothing to say developmental assistance can't solve the problem.

The Neg has some solid Arguments, but they need to build their offense a little more. Also, a greater impact or stat w/ land grabs would be helpful.

Great!