

PFD

FLIP: DD Karbo - Dupree v. DX Jung - Frehner

Public Forum Debate			Gabriel Miller (*AG)		
Round 5			LL 60		Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Jung 4 20 36		1st	Dupree 2 20 36	
2nd	Frehner 1 20 30		2nd	Karbo 3 20 36	
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)			Chaperon #5 School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Is this a low point win? _____					

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Drep
 2/5 1/5
 2/5 5/5

Notes

① Quality of Life
 - 2000% ↑ in Agriculture,
 3.6 mil

* Counter: Military AID Preserves
 Infrastructure Growth
 (Somalia: 1/3 food aid diverted;
 0 in Sahel region, but EATS food
 flows)

* Counter - to the Counter: Chodowski
 evidence about military aid (specific to
 Somalia instability)

① Preserves Infrastructure Growth
 - Mali crisis: Push back was a
 result of insufficient military AID

② Stability (Georgetown study → Drugs, arms, terror
 need military aid)
 * Counter: UN - 37% reduction of terror,
 92% ↓ in recruitment in Chad

- Why I gave this point to

Con: They mentioned specific
~~mita~~ measures, such as border security,
 which avoid funding corrupt governments
 and funneling arms into unstable regions

- Global Criminality of Drug trade needs
 military aid; response that Dev. aid reduces
 drug trafficking (made in summary) ~~was~~ had no
 evidence.

At the end of the debate,
 I was convinced that both ~~types~~
 of aid are ~~more~~ necessary in tandem.
 The Con's framework, ~~on~~ this
 situation, wins.

MOONEY
AYEN, KEITH

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AD Relich - Aradhyula v. CN Maitra - Gupta


Public Forum Debate			Keith Ayen (*CA)		
Round 5			SS 314		Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Gupta	3	1st	Aradhyula	2
		18			19
2nd	Maitra	4	2nd	Relich	1
		17			19
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 ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PFD

FLIP: AS Pierre - Draper v. CA Matteotti - Sweat

Public Forum Debate		TK Berl (*CX)	
Round 5		LL 147	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Preston St Pierre (2)	18	1st
2nd	Draper (3)	17	2nd
The winner of this debate was		Points (0-20)	
Affirmative () Negative (X)		18 TB 17	
(Circle Winner)		19	
Is this a low point win? _____		 Judge's Signature LAHS / Parent / Contracts Officer School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Excellent Debate in spite of crazy round work!!

AFF - LOST YOUR PLACE OCCASIONALLY, and blurred through papers!
 Basically won the round because of 2 things:

1) opponent conceded to your definition early, and never recovered allowing you to hammer the difference between Developmental econ/Humanistic Aid.

2) Moral contentions are not allowed as you can not refute.
 Overall good case - a little more review so you can keep track.

NEG - Unfortunately I had to give this to the other team for the reasons above. Your case is excellent, flow fantastic, and cross the best. Please define your own side and defend & expand on your own def.

PFD

FLIP: CP Jagadish - Sridhar v. DH Yang - Haider

Public Forum Debate			Nicholas Petsas (*AS)		
Round 5			LL 108		Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Yang	1	1st	Jagadish	3
		20			19
2nd	Haider	2	2nd	Sridhar	4
		20			19
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)			Salpointe / U of A 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 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~You left 20 seconds~~

You left 20 seconds left in the constructive... attack their case.

IDK why everyone is freakin out
about giving up your cases
you don't have multiple
copies?

RFD: The Con won the debate today because they
proved that Peacekeeping troops could help to stabilize the
Sahel region which outweighs the Pro's mitigated
offense on malaria.

This was a crazy close round. It has never taken me that long
to disclose before. I am sorry for the wait. That round was
intense & good luck in out-rounds.

~~MEYER, PAM~~
Anderson, Matt

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DT Bhatnagar - Wadhwa v. CN Guo - Sadler

Public Forum Debate			Pam Meyer (*DH)		
Round 5			LL 240	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Wadhwa 3	17	1st	Sadler 4	17
2nd	Bhatnagar 2	18	2nd	Guo 1	20
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)			 Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			<u>Red Mountain</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

There was a lot of conflicting, unresolved evidence on both sides. Ultimately, due to the evidence presented in the round, and as my perspective as a judge, I'm evaluating the region as an unsafe region in many places (evidence given for Darfur, Mali, spillover areas, etc) because there would be no point in debating over a region that is completely stable & safe. The 135% terrorism increase given by the affirmative only applied to anti-American attacks, not overall, and the negative provided evidence that terror attacks had gone down since the French intervention overall. Also, secure areas made twice as efficient use of aid than insecure regions - giving me reason to ultimately vote negative because negative turns the affirmative benefits against them with simultaneous military aid being used. Very close, good round, good luck, etc.



PJSTH

LAGIGLIA, KATHRYN

KRAGER, BRODERICK

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: CP Khelghati - Mobarhan v. FG Nobby - Dowell

Public Forum Debate		Broderick Krager (*AJ)	
Round 5		LL 103	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker Negative Points (0-20)
1st	Nobby	2 (17)	1st Mobarhan 3 (16)
2nd	Dowell	4 (15)	2nd Khelghati 1 (18)
The winner of this debate was		K. Le Hejin Judge's Signature	
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		CN 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 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Mobarhan

CON

Nobby

AFF

Confused by your switch to Neg. Great pace BOTH
 make sure judge is aware before beginning

Got passion
 Probably should not ask judge Qs during opp's prep time

Clear / understandable content AF
 argument easy to follow
 good job

Khelghati

Good use of voice inflection for emphasis

Good pace

DID NOT APPEAR 2

Listen to app during growth

Dowell

pace good but your

gave the material AND that you

AND BODY LANGUAGE too
 E.R. end. Don't trail off @ even if out of theme. Finish strong

- Seemed like you were unsure
 for me personally
 hesitations "um"
 impression a lot
 might not know that very well.

Meathran

NEC

1. from ?

2. owned resources

What ?

switched

that was comparing

Class - you both asked what unanswered

design area

Dowell

1. development
2. economy & m
3. climate change

KE

Nobby

Kelgah

Priorities

reducing terrorism increase

3 climate change

humanitarian aid

short & long

your arguments and

time

rules

leave everyone already known rules

At this

in room

11:00 to 12:00

CROSS

PFD

FLIP: AD Rubin - Irfan v. FD Shah - Hu

Public Forum Debate		Gabi Davenport (*CC)	
Round 5		COWDN 215	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	<u>Shah</u>	^{2nd} 18 23	1st
2nd	<u>Hu</u>	^{4th} 15 25	2nd
The winner of this debate was		Points (0-20)	
<u>Affirmative</u> Negative		3rd 17 27	
(Circle Winner)		2nd 18 28	
Is this a low point win? <u>Yes</u>		1st 5	
		Judge's Signature	
		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Oral Critique given.

PFD

FLIP: AD Mazza - Russell v. CN Han - Foster

Public Forum Debate			Syed Hussain (*DH)		
Round 5			LL 247		Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Mazza Russell 2	18.5	1st	Han 4	17.5
2nd	Mazza 1	19	2nd	Foster 3	18
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature ASU School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Affirmative Negative					
(Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? _____					

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- 1:40
- 1:00
- Aff
- Creative Framework
 - Earlier in the debate you used most of the crossfire time - you should try to be a little more equitable and share it more
 - thought you were ahead on the argument about evaluating consequences outside of the Sahel region for aid given in the region so I was surprised to see you abandon that
 - would have spent more time explaining the warrants in your evidence about developmental aid fixing corruption
- Neg
- make sure you're not letting the aff hog all of the crossfire time
 - thought your analysis of arguments in the context of your framework was good, but could have spent more time defending your framework


Reason for decision: aff wins needed argument that developmental assistance fixes corruption so they can access their benefits about lives, econ. and environment.

VAIL, ROSE

2014 ASU Southwest Championship


PFD

FLIP: DX Lim - Tang v. AH McGraw - Baca

Public Forum Debate		Rose Vail (*CN)	
Round 5		LL 273	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	<u>Daniel Tang</u> 1	<u>19</u>	1st
2nd	<u>David Lim</u> 3	<u>16</u>	2nd
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>		<u>Hamilton</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:



PFD

FLIP: AX Brobst - Bedard v. DC Garrett - Andrade

Public Forum Debate		Joel Guy (*AC)			
Round 5		LL 102	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM		
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	<u>Garrett</u>	<u>20</u>	1st	<u>Bedard</u>	<u>18</u>
2nd	<u>Andrade</u>	<u>19</u>	2nd	<u>Brobst</u>	<u>17</u>
The winner of this debate was					
Affirmative		Negative			
(Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>					
			Judge's Signature		
			<u>Joel Guy</u>		
			<u>CPA (AC) / communist party / freelance</u>		
			School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Garrett - You were fast but clear. I don't normally like speed, but you handled it well.

~~Andrade - You get a lot of points in CX. You also seem to lack the resolve to be forceful in delivery.~~

Bedard

Andrade - you had very minimal coverage in Pro2 / at the off.

Brobst - make me your attacks matter - don't waste speech time repeating "no impact" 34 times

Good CX

All - You're saying good things ^ have excellent clash... but are addressing the wrong things. There's no evidence comparison, just pretences of one being superior to another.

RFD - Neither side tells me what's important (what I should prioritize), yet have to assume. Both like life, both like ↓ conflict, only Brobst needed stats to weigh. The Colombia ^ Mali evidence seemed important - I didn't hear any reasons why it was inherently wrong beyond applicability ^ date... but each case relies on past precedents to operate. I don't get the link / importance of Bro3, but I ^ agree strong enough that to win the round.

PFD

FLIP: AX Thakar - Saha v. FD Kumar - Surendra

Public Forum Debate			Chanise McClure (*AK)		
Round 5			LL 248		Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Saha 1	20 30	1st	Surendra 4	17 18
2nd	Thakar 2	19.5	2nd	Kumar 3	18 19
The winner of this debate was			Alexis J. Hollingshead Judge's Signature		
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)			LD coach - Horizon 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 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I love this case.
 Saha - VERY strong CX.
 I will call time.

You're right, nobody is solving terrorism. Thank you, Thakar, for interjecting that into grand cross.

Very hard to decide between speaks.

~~Pro case~~ Aff
 Kumar - response to ~~pro~~ case with Chad evidence is not very strong and doesn't really address the five points in the Aff case

Do not reread the card to me that your partner JUST read ~~should~~.

... You don't address any of the 5 affirmative impacts in your final rebuttal?

RFD: Neg never replies to Dorey (sp?) evidence that tells me military aid increases corruption (a Neg harm). Neg doesn't tell me that the Aff impacts, ESPECIALLY from Education, don't exist, just that they're "not as important as terrorism" yet Neg isn't solving for terrorism. First, majority of evidence not from Sahel and second, Neg can't explain what the "military aid" in Nigeria/Mali/ cards consist of. I vote Aff

PFD

FLIP: DS Carlton - Schieke v. AO Curtis - DeTaboada

Public Forum Debate		Lisa Lincoln (*FC)			
Round 5		LL 270	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM		
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	<u>Schieke</u> 3	<u>16</u>	1st	<u>Curtis</u> 4	<u>15</u>
2nd	<u>Carlton</u> 1	<u>17</u>	2nd	<u>DeTaboada</u> 2	<u>17</u>
The winner of this debate was <u>Affirmative</u> Negative (Circle Winner)			 Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			<u>Desert Academy</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Everyone was so nice to each other in this debate - thank you! Both teams were equally matched with some good clash.

Schieke/Carlton - Please work on not saying "like" so much.

Curtis/Taboada - Don't pick up "Likes".

Both Teams work on flow + final speeches to hit all the points. Both side dropped points but Aff won because Neg. got so stuck on education + terrorism and lost sight of their points + good observations. Neg - extend those to the end of the debate.
 Aff - you should work on stronger impacts - good warrants that the Neg left untouched in too many places. ^{Better} Flowing will help so much.

PFD

FLIP: AS Freidman - Gummere v. AD Ackerley - Chen

Public Forum Debate		Steven Bassett (*AG)	
Round 5		COWDN 218	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1	Chen	10	2
3	Ackerley	20	4
The winner of this debate was		Points (0-20)	
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		10 20	
Is this a low point win? _____		Judge's Signature Student School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Prep used = :30

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PFD → Bosley is my friend's dog name

PFD

FLIP: FK Conklin - Dong v. DO Baduria - Spada

Public Forum Debate		Matthew Brandstetter (*FO,DT)	
Round 5		LL 160	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	RANK Points (0-20)	Speaker Negative RANK Points (0-20)
1st	CONKLIN	1 17 3	1st BADURIA 4 15
2nd	DONG	3 16 0	2nd SPADA 2 16.5 0
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		Matthew F Brandstetter Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		FO School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD:

Off evidence from Trinity College is more substantive than the Neg evidence on the Sahel crisis in Dec 2013 — Sahel relatively stable except for Mali and Nigeria. — careful off here!

Given the relative security in the Sahel, DA should be prioritized to gain agricultural advantages —

This is enough to garner an Aff ballot.

PFD

FLIP: CN Su - Gilliam v. DH Meyer - Sikora

Public Forum Debate		Craig Skelton (*DN)	
Round 5		LL 107	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	(3) Sikora	17	1st (2) Su
2nd	(1) Meyer	18	2nd (4) Gilliam
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		J. Chris Gny Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		Chandler Prop / Quantum School / Affiliation / Occupation Mechanic	


DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Su (Negative) fast delivery, good CX
 Sikora (Affirmative) more clear, good opening
 Gilliam (Negative) Heavy handed in questioning
 Meyer (Affirmative) strong is cross X
 Both cases became muddled muddled
 when they started agreeing with each
 other. Neg came off a little too pushy
 and didn't fully flesh out its argument

PFD

FLIP: DT Bopardikar - Misra v. DZ Tennakoon - Grewal

Public Forum Debate				Julian Crown (*FK)			
Round 5				LL 149		Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Rank	Points (0-20)
1st	Bopardikar	1	15	1st	Tennakoon	3	15
2nd	Misra	4	15	2nd	Grewal	2	15
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____				 Judge's Signature Leland / Coach School / Affiliation / Occupation			

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

As far as I understand, nobody in this round is right about Mali's coup d'etat. I'm not positive, but I'm confused nonetheless.

Tennakoon: Why read so fast if you're not going to use all four minutes?

I really don't understand how military aid will prevent corruption.

PFD

FLIP: FC Kelehan - Miller v. CN Rudrapatna - Phan

Public Forum Debate			Darius Ansari (*AG)		
Round 5			SS 234		Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Riley Kelehan	3 17	1st	Akshata Rudrapatna	4 17
2nd	Risc Miller	2 18	2nd	Sean Phan	1 18
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)			 Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			Chaparral HS - student School / Affiliation / Occupation		


DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

At the end of the round I had to buy the Neg's framework on security, which the AFF conceded to. Based on this I slightly preferred the analysis they provided on security over the AFF, which only relied on poverty. Both teams failed to really provide solvency and ~~de~~ could have provided better evidence to support ^{more} their points.

PFD

FLIP: CP Elzarka - Gutala v. DT Sahoo - Papakipos

Public Forum Debate			Mitchell Dyer (*DF)		
Round 5			LL 43		Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Papakipos	3	1st	Gutala	20
2nd	Sahoo	4	2nd	Elzarka	20
The winner of this debate was					
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)			 Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			Mesquite/Bid Round Briefs School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff- You need to explain the warrants in your case more adequately.
 Especially with the standard deviation claims that you make
 so much (Papakipos, you should talk more in GxP)

Neg- Your genocide argument is probably really easy to turn...
 (You're both really good, though, so what do I know?)

RFD: From my point of view, Military assistance is necessary to secure the
 region because it prevents threats like genocide and terrorism. It
 also opens the proverbial flood gates of developmental assistance
 and operates like a magnifying glass on aff impacts. The argument
 about things being in the status quo is very non-responsive considering
 the neg case claims these issues are up and coming.
 Because the threat is imminent, I negate.

C2 PFD P1
FLIP: AJ Pulcifer - Asa v. DH Mitina - Chung

Public Forum Debate		Joel Underwood (*DD)		
Round 5		LL 271	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker Negative Points (0-20)	
1st	Mitina	17	1st Asa	19
2nd	Chung	16	2nd Pulcifer	18
The winner of this debate was		Judge's Signature		
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature DD		
Is this a low point win? _____		School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Underwood@seattlecademy.org (flow mailed upon request)

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pretty clear Con win as the Pro got a bit disorganized in the second half of the round. May have been the result of a tech issue... Too bad.

Both sides are telling me a great deal about what will happen if we do X, but neither are really showing me how that would occur.

Don't scant me on sign-posting. If I can't flow it or I don't know where to put the fact/arg, it does you little good.

Judges aren't scales; we don't decide rounds merely based on mass of cards. Relate them.

PFD

FLIP: DH Lee - Lee v. DT Duraiswamy - Misra

Public Forum Debate			Jonathan Garza		
Round 5			LL 269		Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Lee 1	20	1st	Misra 43	20
2nd	Lee 2	20	2nd	Duraiswamy 32	20
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			 Judge's Signature <u>Independent</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Duraiswamy, you spent too much time on Framework in your rebuttal

Everyone, calm down in CXs!

RFD: I look at Framework first. Both sides agree on long term. Viewing the lense through this makes the round nearly impossible to weigh, however Aff mentioned at the top of their case that both kinds of aid aren't mutually exclusive. That's compatible with the prioritize definition. That said, military can still help in the short-term, with aid taking over in the long-term. Since Neg relied on the short-term in order to access the long-term. That opened up Aff's impacts since that was the only response

PFD

FLIP: DT Jagadeesh - Thirumalai v. AD Bai - Donovan

Public Forum Debate			Dennis Karjala (*CS)		
Round 5			LL 268		Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	THIRUMALAI 1	17	1st	BAI 3	15
2nd	JAGADEESH 2	16	2nd	DONAVAN 4	14
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 ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Had an extensive critique after the competition. Both sides need to focus on a single coherent thread that organizes all their supporting data. Pro has to concede that dev. aid has been increased but a proper approach can work. Con has to concede military aid has been increased but a carefully tailored approach to training a security force to maintain order is essential to economic development. Negative side here argued too strongly for avoiding specifics and using only the general terms of the resolution.

PFD

FLIP: DN Torpy - Apple v. AO Ahooja - Isaacs

Public Forum Debate		Tiffany Tibbetts (*FG)	
Round 5		LL 262	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Torpy 2	19.5	1st
2nd	Apple 1	20	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		<u>G CA</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Torpy - You spoke slower than Ahooja but still a bit fast if a judge tells you to not talk too fast.

Ahooja - when your judge says don't talk too fast that they can't flow, then don't talk so fast. Also, you come across overly aggressive in cross

• Don't have so much evidence that you can't even find what you have referenced. or have it better organized

Decision:

If not the whole region is full of terrorists and Dev. Assistance will fix the root issue of poverty then it should be prioritized. So Based on key voters given, Aff wins.

YANG, ROGER

2014 ASU Southwest Championship


PFD

FLIP: AO Muddukrishna - Sharma v. CN Ramesh - Wang

Public Forum Debate		Roger Yang (*DH)	
Round 5		LL 249	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker <i>Hamilton</i>	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker <i>Carlsbad</i>
1st	<u>Ramesh</u> <u>3</u>	<u>17</u>	1st
2nd	<u>Wang</u> <u>4</u>	<u>17</u>	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative <u>Negative</u>		<i>[Signature]</i>	
(Circle Winner)		Judges Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>		<i>Presentation 15.</i>	
		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:



PFD

FLIP: AD Shibano - Rubalcava v. DS Fedasiuk - Wakefield

Public Forum Debate		Matt Anderson (*CA)			
Round 5		LL 241	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM		
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Rubalcava	20	1st	Wakefield	18.5
2nd	Shibano	19	2nd	Fedasiuk	19.5
The winner of this debate was Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>Yes</u>			Samantha Hausler Judge's Signature Palo Verde HS School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I vote Neg because they give me the greater solvency. They have more recent peacekeeping evidence to save more lives. Development Aid won't solve until there is security in the region and ~~that only harm~~ that makes it worthless to put in Dev Aid. Timeframe becomes the final voter on Framework because you both have fairly intangible #s of lives saved. Therefore, the thing that must happen first is security given by Military Aid. Even if you grant the aff their solvency they have to stabilize the region first.

Great Round. You are all fantastic debaters.

PFD

FLIP: FO Flores - Lee v. AF Seo - Lawrence

Public Forum Debate		Jami Schulman (*AG)	
Round 5		LL 10	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative (2)	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Lee 4	17	1st
2nd	Flores 2	18	2nd
The winner of this debate was		Judge's Signature	
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? <u>Yes</u>		Chaparral Hecker School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Lawrence: very clear constructive
good reference to distinctions in evidence during final focus

Seo: great counter-pts in constructive (corruption, problems w/ their study)
very strong responses in cross

weakest pt - terrorism
strongest pt - better w/ military than corrupt gov's

Lee: constructive got a little confusing
great counter point in final focus - strength of safety nets

Flores: could have expanded on mali rebels
great constructive - many strong points

weakest pt - safety nets - gets stronger w/ final focus
strongest pt - agricultural reforms

PFD

FLIP: DH Kim - Soni v. FC Bacon - Colfax

Public Forum Debate			David Barclay (*DK)		
Round 5			LL 150		Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Soni	③ 17	1st	Colfax	① 19
2nd	Kim	② 18	2nd	Bacon	④ 16
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			Kris Cella Judge's Signature Catalina Foothills HS. School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision: Both teams agree that military aid is needed in concert with Developmental aid. The pro side made a stronger case for Developmental Aid as a priority with military aid on an "AS NEEDED" basis. Some positive impacts have come from DEV. Aid alone and DEV. Aid LEADS to long term solutions to more problems. CON DID NOT SHOW conclusively that military aid lends sufficient stability to increase effectiveness of DEV. Aid.

Pro

Need Both military + DEV
But DEV is priority

military aid does not increase stability
Developmental aid increases "long term"

- EDUCATION
- reduced terrorism ideology
- addresses population issues
- health issues

NGOs -

Con

Can't have effective use of DEV. w/out military
military lends stability in short term

Need Both military + DEV. Assist
But Military is priority

With military assist, DEV. Aid
2x more efficient No evidence!


NGOs also part of corruption
issue.

Failure of DEV. Aid alone to
solve problems

ONLY 50% of Aid reaches targets
DEV. Aid inefficient w/out milit. aid

PFD

FLIP: FK Niu - Nagarajan v. CP Saraf - Allen

Public Forum Debate			Taylor Chen (*AD)		
Round 5			LL 113		Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	<u>Saraf</u> 3	<u>18</u>	1st	<u>Nagarajan</u> 2	<u>19</u>
2nd	<u>Allen</u> 1	<u>19</u>	2nd	<u>Niu</u> 4	<u>18</u>
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 ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Great point & counterpoint by both teams. Difficult decision but swayed the most by solvency of population problem and not convinced by supporting data that military aid would prevent terrorism. Also, if fight for resources is the problem, then by providing resources (i.e. Aid) would alleviate the problem. Did not like the focus on family planning, agree w/ Neg's point that many of issues are cultural and cannot be changed.

Overall, great job by both teams.

~~ANDRADE, BECKY~~

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

Brian Gavlitz

PFD

FLIP: CP Ramprasad - Heylman v. CN Sethi - Chavda

Public Forum Debate		Becky Andrade (*DC)			
Round 5		LL 109	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM		
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Heylman	① 20 4	1st	Chavda	③ 18
2nd	Ramprasad	② 19 2	2nd	Sethi	④ 17
The winner of this debate was			Judge's Signature		
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative			Desai Vota HS		
(Circle Winner)			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 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

Heylman - excellent, clear delivery

Ramprasad - great delivery & passionate voice. I would have liked more explanation on just what developmental aid is & why it can't be misappropriated. Can't cereal banks be robbed?

Neg

Chavda - strong delivery but I had trouble understanding your C3 b/c of speed

Sethi - Good attacks, but pace was a little hurried

There seems to be a chicken & egg problem - which form of aid needs to come first; the real problem seems to be who to give the aid to.

Aff shows military aid can be misused.

Neg makes a strong point that there can be violent terrorist attacks while developmental aid is implemented, but neg never questioned Aff's assertion that developmental aid can never be misused.

Since M.A. can be misused but D.A. can't, I must vote Aff.

PFD

FLIP: AG Schulman - Nguyen v. FO Palmer - Kim

Public Forum Debate			Jonathan MacMillan (*AA)		
Round 5			LL 105		Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Nguyen 3	19	1st	Kim 1	20 20
2nd	Schulman 4	19	2nd	Palmer 2	20
The winner of this debate was			Jonathan MacMillan Judge's Signature Dougherty Valley HS Coach 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 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision: ~~Arg~~ Neg wins on Locust & Drug arguments & the 100% increase in benefits gained by using M.A.

Nguyen

Kim

Schulman

Palmer

DA = official agencies providing help for people, non-mil

I. DA is required 1,000s
- Malnutrition, cholera (lives lost)

II. Instability
→ DA ↑ Econ Growth
→ Niger, Burkina Faso Solvency
→ Investment

III. Decrease Dependency
- Terrorism causes
↑ 236% ↓ terr by %
(11)

Certain conditions needed, before aid
Standard = Security

I. Security
a. Darfur, Somalia
b. MA → Stability (Bosnia, Kosovo)
II. Current Sahel demands aid

- Locusts
- Pestivine imp. needs sec.
- Increases in crim. traff

• Mali: VS Military intervention led to coup after Libyan fall
• Few places worse than Sahel for corrupt.

→ Developmental aid is prioritized

→ No Solvency for how DA solves
• Arg is not resolutional because of DA def.

→ No economic devel w/o security
- Neg can double impacts w/sec.

→ Poverty is not root of terrorism

→ success not possible w/o MA

Terrorism

Health

Functionality

Economy

Framework
Locusts
Impacts doubled
MA solves for drugs
MA should have been increased to save Mali

DA still makes it
42% of time w/OMA

• Aff has burden of upholding resolution
- If not swayed, Neg wins
• Locust problem needs MA
• East Timor Somalia
• Drug

Canarie, Lizzy
SHOELL, HANNAH

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DX Kirjwal - Aman v. CN Bhatti - Ramadoss

Public Forum Debate			Hannah Shoell (*DA) — Lizzy Canarie		
Round 5			LL 2		Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Sameer Kejriwal 1	19	1st	Anitha Ramadoss 2	18
2nd	Ahmed Ameer 4	17	2nd	Erha Bhatti 3	17
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature ASU School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____					

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Cross Fire: can you have to be able to answer their "do you like saving children OR want military dominance?" question.

2nd aff Rebuttal: you're being a little too Repetitive

2nd neg Rebuttal: you should be more familiar with your evidence, these are all points you should have blocked out.

Cross fire: You sound silly when you say "if you don't know what contraceptives are..." like they know.

1st aff Rebuttal: I'd like to see more comparative analysis.

Also, you dropped contraceptive.

1st neg Rebuttal: I'm glad you pointed out the flaw in their more weighing of your impacts.

2nd aff Rebuttal: bummed you didn't talk about contraceptives. Good job pointing out it's like Vietnam.

2nd neg Rebuttal: I think you need to give more credit.

Aff outweighs, framework is a wash.

Don't think there's enough of a difference between humanitarian + developmental aid.

15 seconds used


39 seconds

30 seconds

1 minute

PFD

FLIP: CP Waters - Elzarka v. DT Lam - Raghib

Public Forum Debate				Simone Saldana (*AH)			
Round 5				LL 148		Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	DT	Points	Speaker	Negative	CP	Points
1st	Raghib	4	16	1st	Elzarka	2	18
2nd	Lam	3	17	2nd	Waters	1	19
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Carter School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative		Negative					
(Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>							

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

First speaker did a very good job on his speech. Evidence was good. Spoke very clear. Great job in crossfire.

First speaker did a great job on her delivery of her speech. Evidence was very good. very clear & organized. Great job in crossfire.


Second speaker did a great job on his speech. Delivery was really good. Evidence was very good, & very clear. Great job on crossfire!!

second speaker did a great job on her delivery on her speech. Rebuttle was excellent. Excellent job on crossfire, very strong!

My decision was based on which side I thought was stronger on their arguments, which had the best rebuttle overall, & I thought that the negative side did the best.

PFD

FLIP: CH Jones - Turner v. DF Ong - Silva

Public Forum Debate		Nick Davis	
Round 5		LL 221	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	4 Jones	18	1st
2nd	1 Turner	19	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		<u>ASU</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg burden of proof - combo? # deaths? 20

lack of security allows terrorists
 combine military short and dev long
 cant get benefits of dev w/o dislodging terror
 corruption

Aff

80% land degraded - starvation 11.3 mil
 dev aid alleviates terrorism - socioeconomic
 fight instability & corruption?

Reasons
~~Qual~~ Framework - Qual of life
 Corruption

PFD

FLIP: DK Ramos - Bathla v. DD Atkins - Atkins

Public Forum Debate		AJ Wakefield (*DS)	
Round 5		LL 243	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Ramos	4 20	1st
2nd	Bathla	3 20	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		 Judge's Signature Desert Vista  School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Good clash during CX, however you both seemed to just fall back into what you each "know", or your comfort zones.

Aff ran a definition of Dev. aid that had zero relevancy to their case, and actually put most of their impacts out of reach. 

Neg's black market resource impact flowed.

PFD

FLIP: DC McClure - Martin v. CN Chew - Diyya

Public Forum Debate		Raj Soni (*DH)	
Round 5		LL 263	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Diyya (3)	17	1st
2nd	Chew (1)	18	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		Basis / parent / Affiliation School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

6 million > 5 million and argument was effective
 to 5 million number was shaky to begin with.

I would have left out the part of
 military aid actually being development aid so good
 you dropped that argument.

PFD

FLIP: FK Gilbert - Gowda v. CC Hunt - DeNicola

Public Forum Debate			Angela Buzan (*DC)		
Round 5			SS 304		Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Gilbert ②	19	1st	① DeNicola	19
2nd	Gowda ③	19	2nd	④ Hunt	26
The winner of this debate was			Angela Buzan Judge's Signature Perry HS School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Affirmative Negative					
(Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? _____					

60
30

← you can't clarify for your partner during for cross.

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Gilbert (A) Read the resolve. You're opening the round.

① Agriculture tandem farming effective, teaches resilience

② Military aid harmful
↑ violence, executions ↑ 54%

③ Improved governance
* Poverty trap.
reform - accountability

Gowda (B) Effectiveness → prioritization: (clear)
- Aid. Not part of Sahel
- 18 mil. dying of starvation
- If aid doesn't work, keep working on it.
↑ Aid ↓ corruption (card?) (faulty logic here) through NGOs?

"First things, first, judge"
→ WOAH - be careful w/ your tone.

DeNicola (A) you're improved significantly since the last time I judged you. Nice work.

① Child soldiers sought by rebels & governments
② Implement political stability (has this worked in the past?)
③ Aid worsens situation
↑ debt ↑ inflation ↑ conflict
100% govt spending = aid? (card?)
\$150B/corruption
≠ \$1/day b/c of development aid?

Hunt (B) military first. Agriculture still okay
"A whole packet about it" ← this is not a citation.
Re: 2: military aid includes peace officials (include this in observations & framework)
"Govts dep on foreign aid. Begging for us & getting what begging for." (2)
"Desperate → seek children - let's give them real soldiers" ← woah! Huge point for human aid.

Please have all of your articles available for review - either printed or in e-format. If requested, please simply provide it - don't extensively defend & explain it off the dock.
NO - it's not logic to assume that's the fix! Slaves v soldiers! mental training.
These are the reasons why we won "war" profession.

2d Se
removal

PFD

FLIP: AS Mills - Mills v. AC Ferdowsian - Fox

Public Forum Debate			Natasha Iyer (*AX)		
Round 5			LL 106		Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	<u>Ferdowsian</u> 1	<u>16.5</u>	1st	<u>David Mills</u> 4	<u>16</u>
2nd	<u>Fox</u> 2	<u>16.5</u>	2nd	<u>John Mills</u> 3	<u>16</u>
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO.</u>			 Judge's Signature <u>S. Francis</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Fox, don't talk during your partner's cross! NBD, but just write him a note or something. Prompting is NOT COOL.


John, you need to organize your responses better.  Signpost!
 ↑
 Really, ALL OF YOU DO...

Rfd: Con does not really respond to anything except through cross application of the prereq arg. At the point where Pro answers this effectively, there is no alt but a pro ballot. Con would have benefited from a greater diversity in arguments, ~~more responses~~ examples, and responses rather than relying so heavily on case.



PFD

FLIP: DF Goulet - Bua v. DZ Warburton - Wong

Public Forum Debate		Alvin Chan (*DO)	
Round 5		LL 114	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Bua	2 19	1st
2nd	Goulet	1 20	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		Palo Verde School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- make sure to really clarify voters → maybe add an impact calc - weigh impacts or who is actually solving better
- kind of unclear/open to judge interpretation

Aff

- extend your last point about helping people at hopes decreases their motivation for ~~being~~ starting coups!

The aff gives more benefits to developmental aid than the neg gives to military.

Both teams prove that they secure the area through diff paths + both paths sort of went uncontested
 aff solves corruption through political parties

aff proves they're better than dev.

PFD

FLIP: FO Bach - Chung v. CX Ahrens - Lathrop

Public Forum Debate			Phoebe Kuo		
Round 5			LL 264		Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	<u>Chung</u> 2	<u>19.5</u>	1st	<u>Lathrop</u> 4	<u>18.5</u>
2nd	<u>Bach.</u> 1	<u>20</u>	2nd	<u>Ahrens.</u> 3	<u>19</u>
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature <u>Newton Van</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		
<u>Affirmative</u> Negative (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? _____					

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1:50

explain why you need
their antep, quicker.

good extension.

not "using"
"both"

grand cross line
should include both
partners

roadmap please.

1:28

needs from general ~~idea~~^{idea}
to specific case.

link anyone together.

good/strong ox for both..

Perhaps grand cross line
should encompass both..

"what's the point of
no action"?

All controls internal link to terror.

also needs "short-term" antep on PW.

→ extends "small works problems"

PFD

FLIP: DZ Lala - Levitt v. DT Lu - Liu

Public Forum Debate		Jeffrey Kuperman (*AO)	
Round 5		LL 274	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	<u>Liu</u>	<u>3</u>	1st
2nd	<u>Lu</u>	<u>1</u>	2nd
		<u>18</u>	
		<u>19</u>	
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative			
(Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		 Judge's Signature	
		<u>Carlsbad HS</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PFD

FLIP: CN Ngo - Agarwal v. AG Kurtzman - Rowe

Public Forum Debate			Mahir Qureshi (*FD)		
Round 5			LL 14		Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	4 Agarwal	15	1st	Rowe	16
2nd	2 Ngo	15	2nd	Kurtzman	15
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)			basic Chandler 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 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff.

Neg.

Rowe

- Agarwal
- eye contact
 - DA provided by official agencies
 - Sahel region in poverty
 - 80% degraded?
 - 18 million affected by lack of food & drought
 - malnutrition
 - 180,000 refugees
 - 16 million will be affected by DA
 - 2. education
 - younger men
 - 3. military is not a priority
 - no evidence

- Prioritize order of importance
- security still problem
- ineffective aid in Sahel
- military org. prevents further destabilization
- enforce law
- short time stability :: long term security
- developmental aid career crime
- due to corruption, 60% DA is retracted
- World Bank corruption
- goals unfulfilled
- military necessary pre-requisite
- 100 million euros
- 16% aid is being distributed satisfactorily

2=00

-15

-20

-1-25

0

PFD

FLIP: CA Kelly - Labban v. CC Knight - Shafstall

Public Forum Debate			Juan De La Cruz (*CO)		
Round 5			COWDN 203		Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Labban	4 15	1st	Knight	2 15.5
2nd	Kelly	1 15.5	2nd	Shafstall	3 15
The winner of this debate was <u>Affirmative</u> Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____			Craig Skelton Judge's Signature Marist School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The round is a presentation of different positions on the resolution. The debate element is not always present. Increase Clash! Analyze positions so that you attack the other team. What is presented is done so on a shallow level. Engage deeper in the topic.

Pro: too much time spent on definitions in case
 more questions in cross - attack Con's case
 More evidence

Con: more questions in cross
 more evidence
 Sahel examples

This round is difficult to decide for the reasons mentioned above. Pro provides the most solvency and benefits through saving the hungry and sick. Con explains how MA could solve but provides no reasonable examples. The Afghan example is far from the Sahelian issues facing the region.

PFD

FLIP: DH Cohen - Kovalchuk v. CC Goodman - McCollum

Public Forum Debate		Kylie Conway	
Round 5		LL 104	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Goodman Kovalchuk	2 20	1st
2nd	Cohen McCollum	1 20	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		ASU School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg Conceded to AFF's "prioritize" def. but as focus
 70% of funds to one area + 10% to another

~~Base Case~~

Verbal RFD

PFD

FLIP: AG Artigue - Ramaswamy v. DT Panja - Nakos

Public Forum Debate			Alyssa Martin		
Round 5			LL 12		Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Nakos 1	20	1st	Ramaswamy 4	18
2nd	Panja 3	19	2nd	Artigue 2	19
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Perry HS School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____					

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Nakos:

Con 1) Longterm benefit/Agriculture

- lack of infrastructure
- small scale water-collection

Con 2) Females

- family planning; girls education

Con 3) Blowback

- spreading terror w/in the area
- military aid begets terrorist activities

Panja:

Con 1) Peacekeeping/History

- instability ↑

Con 2) Opportunity cost

- lack of resources leads to terror
- increase

Addressed Population Growth
 good

Ramaswamy:

Con 1) Peacekeeping

- reduces risk of 2nd war
- creates stability that dev. can't

Con 2) Gov. spending is finite

- Coups (wanting dev. aid \$)
- security needed first

Artigue:

Con 1) Failure of Agriculture

- raising prices of fertilizer

Con 2) Blowback

- Peacekeeping comes largely from non-Western sources

Con 3) Cherry picking

- choosing soap operas vs. overall dev. aid

 Defense ~~arguments~~ could be stronger

good use of metaphor w/o being side-tracked

Your arguments were solid, but the deciding factor specifically, was your focus on the history of military aid being linked to instability, and equally your focus on stability post-aid/post-withdrawal of foreign money

Good arguments, but you are too idealistic in your arguments and do not account for corruption.

PFD

FLIP: CS Thomas - Friend v. AG Thorley - Mouti

Public Forum Debate		Rajan Sheth	
Round 5		LL 272	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Mouti 1	15	1st
2nd	Thorley 2	15	2nd
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 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Terrorism solved by developmental ariel.

Oral feedback given.

PFD

FLIP: CA Nipper - Bogar v. CH Poole - Brescia

Public Forum Debate			Arthur Chandra (*DX)		
Round 5			LL 13		Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Brescia 1	15	1st	Nipper 3	14
2nd	Poole 2	15	2nd	Bogar 4	14
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>			 Judge's Signature Redlands HS School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Comments were given in Record

JERNIGAN, WADE

Limitone, Steven

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AO Sheets - DeSantis v. CP Kikkeri - Taylor

Public Forum Debate			Wade Jernigan (*DC)		
Round 5			SS 236	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Taylor	3 17	1st	Sheets	2 18
3rd 2nd	Kikkeri	4 16	4th 2nd	DeSantis	1 20
The winner of this debate was					
Affirmative Negative			Judge's Signature		
(Circle Winner)			DeSantis		
Is this a low point win? No			School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision: Developmental assistance should be prioritized over military aid in Sahel region of Africa

Util is only weighing mechanism I'm given,
and that's what I'm voting off of.

Since Aff never really addresses
it and concedes that Neg

Solves short term I vote
Neg.

MARCHI FRANKIE
HOSSEINI, LEILA

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DX Ricksecker - Mandolang v. AK Russell - Ferguson

Public Forum Debate		Leila Hosseini (*AG) <u>FRANKIE MARCHI</u> <u>ASU</u>	
Round 5		LL 275	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker Negative Points (0-20)
1st	<u>Mandolang</u>	<u>16</u>	1st <u>Ferguson</u> <u>18</u>
2nd	<u>Ricksecker</u>	<u>17</u>	2nd <u>Russell</u> <u>14</u>
The winner of this debate was		Frankie Marchi	
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>N</u>		<u>Chaparral</u> <u>ASU</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

3:17, 4:06, 1:56, 1:43

4:00, 4:01, 2:06, 2:02

~~Russell/Ferguson didn't show up~~

1:00 prep

17 prep
30 prep
1:30

- Full official econ
econ grants
tied sp

LA: doesn't need mil-aid

ob:

Prioritize most needed
short term

cond long term

1A: zero hunger
2032
850,000 children
malnourished
1b: agriculture
stable water
1005 hectares
stable weather

crime steal food
crime b/c food

3.6 million saved

2: Democracy
from infrastructure

- Do they want
Democracy

destabilized aid
will be victim of
corruption

2: death?

Past example bad
use someone else

mil-aid side
w/ evil

Pan Sahal
2002 initiative bad

dev-aid
mil aid

1: Corruption
creates deprivation
better security
better stability
better life

Past examples
Pan Sahal

2: Terrorism
928 attacks 11%
1.5 million displaced
1-150 15-64
- more stats
required
- Not enough
Impact

Instability
3A: regional can spread to regional
3b: Global is made up of regions

observation card
stat
vs.

2: reg

8.25 billion
657 billion
1.7

dev-aid creates violence
throwing money at the problem

~~CRITICISM ON BACK~~

RFD on Back

First off great debate. Really.

Aff contention 2 was weak because Sahel does not act as a whole. Getting total unifying democracy is impossible to prove and was not shown in the round. Long-term agriculture and short term zero hunger relief had enough impact to win the round. Aff did not attack NEG 3A & 3B well enough.

Neg contention 2 did not have enough impact. Deaths from terror attacks would help. Contention 1 would be excellent if there was a new group that would jump into to try otherwise the Aff can bring up past examples to counterpoint. NEG would have loved/preferred card on throwing money on the problem to have been better focused and specific to the zero hunger Aff 1A, but it wasn't. Also, great point on how corruption would thwart and steal developmental assistance and military aid should be a pre-requisite, but corruption of military aid also needs to be addressed to make this work.


LEBEDA, ROBERT

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

Erik Feneboe

PFD

FLIP: AK Faulao - Vendemiatti v. DC Jensen - Jernigan

Public Forum Debate		Robert lebeda (*DZ)	
Round 5		LL 145	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker Negative Points (0-20)
1st	Faula 3	18	Jensen 2 19
2nd	Vendemiatti 4	17	Jernigan 1 20
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature	
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		Chamirude/coach 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 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~Aff did not show~~

COW

- Developmental assistance bad
- ^{Devel} ~~Env.~~ system → no pol. stability
- Tax for dev aid
- Gov stability
- Humiliation
- Prioritize
- Instable dev. air way
- No security → no dev
- Corruption → rest goes to out govt
- ~~Milit~~
- Can't guarantee aid

~~Neg keep being~~ Aff awesome!

- FW - Necessity → Prioritize
- Underdevelopment = Terror
- Landmines → Killing civilians + livestock
- AIDS → Leading killer
- Malnutrition
- Dev aid first → Low econ growth
- Intl assistance must be given
- Intl pressure solve
- Underdevelopment caused by poverty → Root cause
- Military aid fails w/o dev assistance
- ~~Peace~~ in poverty

RFD: Great Round! Although developmental aid is imperative, I don't see how it is possible for dev aid to be given w/o security. Mali example excellent. Aff need evidence to show Dev aid would be successful implemented w/o military aid.

CHUNG, JAMES

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AA Shen - Ziaee v. AG Blecker - Blecker

Public Forum Debate			James Chung (*DH)		
Round 5			COWDN 213		Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Taha Ziaee	2 19	1st	D. Blecker	3 16
2nd	Jamie Shen	1 10	2nd	A. Blecker	4 15
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____			<i>Seep</i> Horizon / That Camphady School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD:

Ag's argument that
Basic needs m/ come first is
not well handled.

~~GARRETT, BRANDON~~

Adam Buys

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DT Huang - Chona v. AX Akella - Garg

PUSH

Public Forum Debate		Brandon Garrett (*CP) Adam Buys	
Round 5		LL 265	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker Negative Points (0-20)
1st	④ Akash Garg	20	1st ② Joyce Huang 20
2nd	③ Prithvi Akella 20		2nd ① Eesha Chona 20
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <u>Negative</u> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		Adam Buys Judge's Signature Independent School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Oral critiques provided, for further questions
email me at abuys@colgate.edu

Woods, Scott

PFD

FLIP: CN Guo - Sun v. CO Bryant - Riggs

Public Forum Debate		Elizabeth McGonaghey (*DH) Woods, Scott	
Round 5		LL 47	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Bryant 3	19	1st Sun 20
2nd	Riggs 4	20	2nd Guo 20
The winner of this debate was		Judge's Signature	
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)		BASIS Scottsdale coach	
Is this a low point win? NO		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Very spirited round. Excellent skills all around.

Framework - Aff - It is reasonable to think that
 ♀ issues are paramount in developing nations,
 and that war → dehumanization of women...
 Less clear are the links between ~~development~~
 prioritization of ♀ rights and the resolution.
 By focusing exclusively on changing the priority
 to ♀ rights/empowerment, instead of ~~economic~~
 assistance in general, you provide an unfair,
 maybe abusive, burden on the Neg. They
 Can't be expected to prove that the Aff plan won't
 work. That's not P.F.

Neg. must show why mil. Assist. is priority.

given.

War is bad. agreed.
Dehumanization, rape, etc. All bad.

Reducing war is good. agreed

Increasing development assistance is good. agreed.

This round comes down to how
we best reduce war/conflict/terrorism/
displacement and increase aid that
leads to ↓ in poverty and ↓ in bad
outcomes for all, esp. women.

Neg. Aid → ↑ length of conflicts.

This is key. If you give aid in
a conflict, the conflict lasts longer
and more women are raped
and ∴ dehumanized.

In militarily secure regions - war

85% of aid is delivered. In terr.

control areas, 42% - If aid is
good, including aid that → ↑ ♀ rights/etc,
then controlling/securing violent regions is
key to ↑ ♀ rights/outcomes.

The conflict → rape, not the mil. assist.

PFD

FLIP: DT Xie - Bashar v. DA Almanza - Raso

Public Forum Debate			Ryan Newman (*CH)		
Round 5			LL 230	Fri 01/10/14 06:00PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Bashar 3	19	1st	almanza 4	18
2nd	Xie 2	19	2nd	Raso 1	19
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			 Judge's Signature <u>Foothill High school</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The neg ran globalization in the debate Raso read cards instead of arguing their case the definition they look to says aid given by government agencies but the Aff advocates ngo's which are outside of this, ~~and why would military aid not influence them?~~ You never stated this it probably would have you the debate

Both teams did great but I've seen today