

PFD

FLIP: AH McGraw - Baca v. CA Kelly - Labban

Public Forum Debate			Dennis Karjala (*CS)		
Round 6			LL 113		Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Labban 3	15	1st	McGraw 2	17
2nd	Kelly 1	19	2nd	Baca 4	14
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)			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 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both sides did a good job of responding to specific claims by the other. The use by Neg of WWII and Osama Bin Laden were unconvincing and nicely challenged. Aff. made good use of S. Korea and Columbia examples that were not effectively challenged. (Could have pointed to the different cultures, established institutions, etc., especially for S. Korea).

Neg. emphasis on equal priority was technically sound but, for me personally (perhaps not all judges), ~~was~~ was a bit hollow. The substantive issue is development or military aid and I prefer to hear that debate on the merits.

Both sides need to work on causation: Doing X in a country that later has characteristics Y does not necessarily mean that X caused Y. Things are very complex. Both sides did well here conceding the need for the other side's priority (developmental aid or military), properly focussing the problem on the relative amounts. I would emphasize that even more in the future rounds.

PFD

FLIP: DT Duraiswamy - Misra v. DH Yang - Haider

Public Forum Debate		Keith Ayen (*CA)	
Round 6		LL 107	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	<u>YANG (2)</u>	<u>18</u>	1st
2nd	<u>HAIDER (1)</u>	<u>19</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>RED MTN - HIGH</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

BOTH TEAMS PERFORMED SUPERLATIVELY IN PRESENTING & SUPPORTING THEIR CASES. EXCELLENT REASONS AND LOGICAL ARGUMENTS WERE MADE BY BOTH TEAMS.

AFF WAS GIVEN THE WIN BECAUSE THEY DID A BETTER JOB OVERALL OF ADDRESSING & DECONSTRUCTING THEIR OPPONENTS ARGUMENTS, PARTICULARLY THE POINT REGARDING NEG'S CONFLICT WITH RESPECT TO THEIR OWN ARGUMENTAL TOPIC OF 'PRIORITIZATION'!

GREAT JOB TO BOTH TEAMS!

PFD

FLIP: AG Kurtzman - Rowe v. AK Faulao - Vendemiatti

Public Forum Debate		Scott Woods (*DH)	
Round 6		LL 264	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Vendemiatti 1	20	1st
2nd	Faulao 2	18	2nd
The winner of this debate was		Judge's Signature	
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 BASIS Scottsdale	
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 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Kurtzman - Rebuttal speech could have been cleaner, sign posted better.
 Faulao - Don't shout. Your crossfire voice is very pleasant and clean. Use that in your speeches.
 Vendemiatti - Effective Summary - Excellent turn on policing.

neg. Police / rule of law - I didn't buy that mil. Assistance is part of police force development / increase in rule of law. Aff attacked this, so it falls.

Framework - Long term benefits is very strong - whoever can show the greatest L.T.B. through their prioritization scheme should win. This works w/ neg. framework. If the neg can show equal priority works for long term, or mil. Ass. or even dev. Aid works in long term, they should win. Aff must show Dev. Ass. priority ~~better~~ → ↑ good things / ↓ in bad things.

Over.

RFD

- ① Solving for current terrorism/crime ..
Att attacks root problem, solves for long term.
Shows how killing terr./criminals does not
→ elim. of terr. They will infiltrate. These
are porous areas. This wasn't really well
developed, but I bought it, and Reg
didn't show that they could solve
for terr./crime by mil. assistance. (C.T.
Iraq, Afgh. for failure of mil. solutions to terr./crime)
Also - Mali shown to get worse w/ mil.
assistance, while Niger improved by
rejecting mil. Ass. & embracing direct
development & combating corruption.
Mali & Niger were very strong!

- ② Police networks not mil. assistance related - see
front page.

- ③ Solve for poverty, solve for all problems. Don't
solve for pov., no improvement. Mil. Ass. doesn't
help solve, actually harms.

- ④ Balloon effect.

PFD

FLIP: AG Schulman - Nguyen v. AC Ferdowsian - Fox

Public Forum Debate		Suzanne Sikora (*DH)			
Round 6		COWDN 203	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM		
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Ryan Ferdowsian ③	18	1st	① Levi Schulman	20
2nd	Colby Fox ②	19	2nd	④ Kendrick Nguyen	18
The winner of this debate was Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____			Suzanne C Sikora Judge's Signature Basis Scottsdale School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- stronger arguments shown by negative.
 - different approach to definition of purification - good.
 - not supported how deal w/ terrorism to distribute aid.
 - didn't show how it has worked in the past
 - Neg showed ~~not~~ how food was creating conflict, not addressed how
- Both teams well prepared, well documented
 Thank you for timing!
 Great job - hard work!

PFD

FLIP: AX Brobst - Bedard v. DX Kirjwal - Aman

Public Forum Debate		AJ Wakefield (*DS)	
Round 6		LL 241	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Kirjwal	217	1st
2nd	Aman	416	2nd
The winner of this debate was		Points (0-20)	
Affirmative Negative		173	
(Circle Winner)		221	
Is this a low point win? _____		Pam Meyer Judge's Signature Basis Scottsdale School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Based upon the definition given by the "Negative" the "Affirmative" did not prove that developmental aid is ~~or~~ needed more than the military aid. More examples were needed to show that developmental aid was more successful and that military aid was not at least equal to developmental aid. All parties were well-prepared and knowledgeable. All spoke clearly.

PFD

FLIP: AJ Pulcifer - Asa v. FO Palmer - Kim

Public Forum Debate			Alex Daniel (*DT,AC)		
Round 6			LL 273		Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Kim 3	17.5	1st	Asa 4	17
2nd	Palmer 1	17.5	2nd	Pulcifer 2	17.5
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			 Judge's Signature Harker / Student School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Kim: 7 sub-points? make it easier on everyone & compress this into 2-4 BROAD sub-points. If you have 8 sub-points & 3 of them intertwine, you didn't compress enough. Solid writing though.

Asa: more fluency. Your speed is fine, but make it more balanced. You start from a new breath with a burst of speed and then slow down as you lose breath, balance your breathing to balance speed. Your case is well organized, but you have some evidence that should be expanded on w/ evidence.

Palmer: Solid rebuttal, although you paint w/ too broad a brush sometimes and were prone to ~~fill in~~ blank on me filling blanks. Don't go over your case if 1st speaker, it hasn't been attacked.

Pulcifer: Don't even attempt to cover 8 sub-points, just hammer the contention from an overview of the contention, the entire weakness of an 8 sub-point contention is you can attack it from an overview. 90% of judges hate that many sub-points, be smart & don't play their game. The rest of the rebuttal was good, but be clear. Don't speak too fast just b/c you think it increases your legitimacy, it doesn't.

Kim: Well-organized, but not broad enough. You picked good voters but you didn't summarize → impact calc. you summarized the plan.

you were kind of an *** in grand C-X
no big deal, it was heated all around

Palmer: Recency of a study does not mean I automatically do ~~anything~~ anything. you need to analyze, not just claim 2013 > 2007. nice balance of offensive & defensive voters.


Very broad, but too defensive. I need analysis of your offense and then I need that analysis/offense turned into impact calc. you gave voters, but your analysis did not compell me.

← (ASA): Pulcifer: Good defense, but offense. If you are going to rely on stability, you better prove stability.

RFD: It is important to note, that the ~~offense~~ offense in this round was so weak, I nearly defaulted to the neg, but ultimately the Aff provides some semblance of solvency w/ aggro-forecasting in the sense that they show it could help to some degree. Aff also narrowly wins the terrorism debate primarily through a link-turn that was weak, but more aggressively pushed through the round with analysis, Neg played terrorism argument defensively and does not flow through their competing link-turn w/ analysis.

PFD

FLIP: CP Jagadish - Sridhar v. DT Panja - Nakos

Public Forum Debate		Hannah Shoell (*DA)	
Round 6		LL 13	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker Negative Points (0-20)
1st	Jagadish 1	20	1st Nakos 3 19
2nd	Sridhar 2	20	2nd Panja 4 19
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature	
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		Copper Hills	
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 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1A: You are very good at cross examination2A: You tend to spend more time on your opponents' case than your own, be sure to defend your house as much as you attack theirs. Give more warrants in your last speech, you are going for the right things, just explain them better1N: You are very good at cross examination.2N: You are very good picking the arguments you need to win.

I vote aff because I buy that poverty = terrorism, additionally their card is more recent and has author qualifications. The neg went for "we can solve both" but the evidences telling that military aid is a prelude to developmental aid just says that peace generally follows war.

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AO Ahooja - Isaacs v. AD Ackerley - Chen

Public Forum Debate			Judge <u>Newman, Ryan</u>		
Round 6			SS 304		Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	<u>Chen</u> 4	<u>19</u>	1st	<u>Ahooja</u> 3	<u>19</u>
2nd	<u>Ackerley</u> 2	<u>18</u>	2nd	<u>Isaacs</u> 1	<u>20</u>
The winner of this debate was					
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)			 Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>			<u>Four Hill High School</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This debate really came down to the effectiveness of developmental Aid. The neg's point about \$00 bil being wasted over the last 40 yrs is a great point as is developmental aid supporting 4 million people.

The Aff didn't address some of the neg's points, but the neg didn't extend them try to make a quick point about dropped arguments.

The neg also dropped the aff's contention 2 sub sec. C which was a point that undermined neg's efficiency argument.

extremely close both teams did extremely well

I ended up deciding based on the OECD definition of developmental aid. I think it was talking about the economic help to be in the best interest of the country. It's very vague but the way it's worded and that sentence is singular implying that the economic & well being are the same not separate aspects of this definition.

PFD

FLIP: CP Kikkeri - Taylor v. FD Kumar - Surendra

Public Forum Debate		Darius Ansari (*AG)	
Round 6	2	LL 247	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Rachel Taylor	19	1st
2nd	Samika Kikkeri	22	2nd
The winner of this debate was		Darius Ansari	
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature Chapparral HS - Student	
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 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I voted off of the Aff's ability to basically win the framework debate, which proved that Dev and can solve for the security issue. The Aff had a solid rebuttal, which provided me with evidence proving that dev and attacked the root cause of the problem & should therefore be prioritized. Both teams really lacked substantial numbers / impacts so I most had to go with a theoretical prediction of what's gonna be more effective & the neg didn't seem to have much flow through saying that Mil aid was a better option.

PFD

FLIP: CS Thomas - Friend v. CN Sethi - Chavda

Public Forum Debate			Vincent Nguyen (*AG)		
Round 6			LL 248		Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Chadd 2	17	1st	Friend 1	17
2nd	Sethi 3	17	2nd	Thomas 4	17
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			Li Khanh Judge's Signature Chaparral School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Ultimately, I went AFF because they won the points in food insecurity, sustainability of life and ~~recruitment~~ recruitment. Both sides were very deficient in empirical evidence, I was left begging for some numbers and weighing mechanisms. Both sides could use more organization.

Thomas, don't bring up 9/11, it's nontopical! Use real evidence, not "it was in the news" and "it's more like logic"

PFD

FLIP: DA Almanza - Raso v. AD Bai - Donovan

Public Forum Debate		Katherine Rolfe (*CN)	
Round 6		LL 274	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Tony Almaraz	17	1st
2nd	Adrian Raso	15	2nd
The winner of this debate was		Judge's Signature	
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)		Hamilton	
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 or 4 or 5.


Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirmative Team used statements without statistics
"cherry picking" of facts, and Mr Raso
Got loud too often - very pushy.

Negative: Good use of facts, statistics,
logic. Used various references

PFD

FLIP: CX Ahrens - Lathrop v. DN Torpy - Apple

Public Forum Debate		Brian Gavlick (*DS)	
Round 6		LL 268	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Torpy	① 20	1st
2nd	Apple	③ 18	2nd
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature	
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		Desat Vista HS School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			

16 used DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Torpy - excellent delivery; nice tone
good crossfire questions

Apple - strong delivery,

Lathrop - clear, calm delivery

Ahrens - strong delivery - clear rebuttal



15 used

35 used
45 used

Thanks to both teams for sharing evidence politely. I recommend extra paper copies of cards. I appreciated how both teams provided a framework in the first speeches. Aff does an excellent job of showing the benefits of developmental aid - I questioned the evidence showing that military aid prolongs terror - the data showed a relationship but didn't prove causality. Neg does a fine job of showing the harms of instability, such as the drug trade & point of no return, but only had the example of Mali. Both teams agreed on saving lives - so what saves more lives? I have to weigh the benefits of D.A. vs. the harms of the drug trade & point of no return; I can't quantify the drug trade/P.O.N.R. based on current evidence, so I must vote affirmative.

PFD

FLIP: DC Jensen - Jernigan v. AX Akella - Garg

Public Forum Debate		Alyssa Martin → Berl, TL	
Round 6		LL 10	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker Negative Points (0-20)
1st	Jensen (2)	18	1st Akash Garg (1) 18
2nd	Jernigan (4)	16	2nd Prithvi Akella (3) 17
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature	
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)		LAITZ / Parett /  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 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Excellent Debate w/ equally matched opponents well versed in the subject!!

Neq started with defining and narrowing definition which was accepted by AFF. Ran a very tight well constructed case with narrow framework that allowed for developmental aid in conjunction with military aid. Talked very fast but clearly.

AFF: Excellent case well documented with several references of development assistance success but unable to support fully the prioritization of developmental assistance. Very Polite - Stand strong & Assertive for your beliefs. You both got a little rattled after you had to surrender your case & stopped a little early - power through! Be careful not to let your opponent hammer you into accepting their definition redefine and get them to accept yours!

PFD

FLIP: DD Karbo - Dupree v. CN Guo - Sadler

Public Forum Debate			Neiko Chotras (*CC)		
Round 6			LL 108		Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	<u>Sadler</u> 2	<u>19</u>	1st	<u>Dupree</u> 4	<u>18</u>
2nd	<u>Guo</u> 1	<u>20</u>	2nd	<u>Karbo</u> 3	<u>19</u>
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Phoenix Country Day School 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 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Very persuasive case. Work on the language of your Bio Fuels + Women's Status points. I don't feel like it is very well linked to your case.

The debate on "prioritize" is getting pretty boring. Not interested in the semantics, nor do I think it is important to the round.

Great initial rebuttal. I really appreciate how you are making multiple arguments against contentions, not just one. I think that you need to address their Somalia example or you don't get starvation Solvency.

Your arg that military undermines developmental assistance doesn't mesh with the real world does both at the same time.

I think you need to make more specific links to the Sahel reason throughout your case. I got the feeling that your arguments are more general about addressing instable govts.

I think that some specification of the type of military aid you think is best would help clarify your position.

Your rebuttal focused way too heavily on "security should come first." You need to work on other unique reasons to prioritize military aid.



I thought the summary speech was pretty weak. The only advancing argument that was made was about Ideology and that didn't come with a solid warrant.

You should have gone for the Somalia example to take out their solvency.

RFD: Both teams agreed that they are trying to solve the same issues.
Pro points out Con may undermine developmental aid and create more security concerns. CON could have taken out PRO impacts with Somalia, but didn't go for it. ~~I vote for PRO~~
I vote PRO on solving starvation

PFD

FLIP: DT Jagadeesh - Thirumalai v. CH Jones - Turner

Public Forum Debate				Brandon Garrett (*CP)			
Round 6				LL 262		Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Rank	Points (0-20)
1st	Thirumalai	1	16	1st	Jones	3	15
2nd	Jagadeesh	2	16	2nd	Turner	4	14
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)				 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 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

slow down in CX!

Jones: Try to read case w/ more energy

Turner: Your tone / ~~anger~~ in crosstire makes it hard to listen to you

Hey! Stop calling we "judge"! It's annoying!

Voted on corruption & turns to MA.

Getting up in rebuttal & repeating "I'd like to see the ev for this" for each coat. is not the same as asking for the card.

nice energy / attitude

130
-10
-30

Rude in CX

-23

PFD

FLIP: DH Kim - Soni v. DZ Tennakoon - Grewal

Public Forum Debate		Broderick Krager (*AJ)	
Round 6		COWDN 215	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	2 Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Soni 1	18	1st
2nd	Kim 4	15	2nd
The winner of this debate was		Judge's Signature	
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>		Sunnyslope School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Tennakoon - Please Please Please give empirical proof of the prerequisite argument. It's such a good point, but you aren't making it. How? why? Give me an example. Ask for sources! Good point on corruption, but I need examples. The US did this a lot in the 80s, and 20 years later, uh oh, we kinda created Al Qaeda.

Soni - Great case, great use of speed. Take a bigger stance in crossfire. You aren't obligated to attack his points, all you have to do is clarify them. Ask for sources! Where are these NGOs? How are you decreasing poverty specifically?? Please provide links.

Grewal - I NEED examples and stats for your attack on... well, everything. How many schools are attacked by terrorists? How frequently? When do recipient governments make bad decisions? Like what? And most of all, how much terrorism is being countered by military aid? How am I supposed to trust that?

Kim - Evidence? Proof? You are making great attacks that are 100% true, but I can't believe you because you have no evidence! You tell me that military aid causes more terror, but when has this HAPPENED?!

RFD - economy - con wins - 1 tril is a lot of fucking money. Not worth a few schools and vaccines.

terror - pro wins - 14% flowed thru, and I'd rather have terrorists access development aid than guns and weapons.

education - pro wins - 14%, kinda fed into terrorism.

corruption - pro - I'd rather corrupt officials have development than weapons.

lives - pro - con never attacked properly.

PFD

FLIP: AO Sheets - DeSantis v. CC Hunt - DeNicola

Public Forum Debate		Adam Buys (*AD)	
Round 6		LL 12	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	<u>Destiny DeNicola</u>	<u>18</u> (5)	1st
2nd	<u>Holden Hunt</u>	<u>17</u> (3)	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		<u>Adam Buys</u> Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>		<u>Independent</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Oral critiques and RFD provided, for further questions feel free to email me at abuys@colgate.edu

PFD

FLIP: CC Goodman - McCollum v. AD Shibano - Rubalcava

Public Forum Debate		Jami Schulman (*AG)			
Round 6		COWDN 213	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM		
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
① 1st	Goodman	18	④ 1st	Rubalcava	16
③ 2nd	McCollum	17	② 2nd	Shibano	18
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)			 Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			<u>Chap / Parent / Attorney</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

①A For me, I appreciated your delivery the most. Measured. Articulate. Good eye contact, ~~little demeanor~~ except for 1A round - you read too much. Anecdotes were good, but relied on them a little too much. Nice demeanor. What you gain in a slower pace, you do lose a little on substance by not making as many pts - particularly when you use so much time to set up your anecdotes.

②A You got stronger as you went. Good delivery and eye contact. I thought your own best was during the cross rounds. Struggled a bit summarizing cases, but did a good job on specific issues. I thought you handled the "prioritization" discussions very well. Stick w/ your natural speaking pattern, and you'll do well.

①N - Way too fast. Couldn't understand the arguments. You are reading - not arguing. Not very persuasive as a result. You are very articulate, but at times it seemed like your mouth was working faster than your mind. Almost no eye contact in 1N. Your summary was almost incomprehensible. A lot of these issues can be solved by slowing down - have fun - enjoy it!

②N - Great on eye contact + delivery. Most passionate and believable of the 4 speakers. But, you did stumble often in the substance of your arguments - particularly when you attempted to attack 1A case. Never shut your argument by saying you agree with other side on everything but 1 contention. You concede way too much. Very good job.

PFD

FLIP: CP Waters - Elzarka v. AA Shen - Ziaee

Public Forum Debate			Jonathan Garza		
Round 6			LL 103		Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Elzarka Ziaee 4	17	1st	Ziaee Elzarka 2	20
2nd	Waters Shen 3	18	2nd	Shen Waters 1	20
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <u>Negative</u> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			 Judge's Signature <u>Independent / Student</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Ziaee, It's your partners speech, don't talk during it let alone tell here what to do.
- Waters, you got fast in your rebuttal and your word economy suffered.
- Shen, your rebuttal strategy probably left the Neg undercovered.

RFD: Looking at the framework debate, the definition of developmental assistance was the first priority. Affs (accepted by both teams) definition allowed developmental assistance from UN peacekeepers, but doesn't consider actual military operations. The point of offense that the neg had after looking at the definition was the genocide impact. That outweighs aff. Even with ~~that~~ Affs framework, the cold concession on the Ev card allows neg to win.

PFD

FLIP: AD Rubin - Irfan v. CH Henriott - Wilde

Public Forum Debate			Phoebe Kuo		
Round 6			LL 230		Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Henriott. 3	19	1st	Irfan 2	18.5
2nd	Wilde. 1	19	2nd	Rubin. 4	19
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Mountain View 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 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

: 45

"It's just logical"

on track things more, not just everything.
 → good half arguments.

MPX D
 Turns. - look ✓
 + impact ✓

"define importance"

dropped mlt bad on 1st.

gcx
 → make
 args, ask
 questions.

especially 1A.
 saying "right?"
 or "is this
 true?"
 doesn't make
 a question.

prep-speaking
 - 2nd alt.

don't shake rock while speaking 1:55

1:27


1:27

prep-speaking.

doing only work to explain what importance means throughout
 speech. worry stabilization as FW only extended at end of 2nd.
 too late to weigh/contest.
 so I guess hunger & fear. that's more important
 yay.

PFD

FLIP: CP Elzarka - Gutala v. FO Flores - Lee

Public Forum Debate		Pam Meyer (*DH)	
Round 6		LL 150	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Lee	3 18	1st Gutala
2nd	Flores	4 17	2nd Elzarka
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>yes</u>		 Judge's Signature Red Mt. School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This was an excellent, enjoyable debate. I was not able to make my decision until the final focus. Both sides presented their ideas clearly and attacked each other with precision. Ultimately, it was up to neg to prove that terrorism is enough of a threat in the area to warrant military intervention, but they did not. So I voted Aff.

Aff

:10 :31

Neg

:15 :23 1:15

Not much terrorism in area

absence of law enforcement charge is not permanent

since 1997 (1990's)

only 2% (AQUIM) only

N. Africa not Sahel only rowander

→ outside Sahel

Empirical

Terrorism, drugs & human traff.

- Drugs & human trafficking
- terrorism
- genocide

2. Military aid solves?

- military works for peacekeeping

Insecurity does not affect whole regions - malnutrition does

- Ob1 - Priority to help poor
- Ob2 - Agent of action

malnutri

need security first, then dev

- 1. Safety nets needed
 - effective
 - reduce crime? poverty

- money for poor (financial assist)
- Security needed b4 aid
- makes depend on other econ.

- 2. Increases resistance
 - agri-forest?
 - 1/2 is ~~eng~~ dep on aggr

- little evid that it is self-sust.
- don't create dependency w/ agri forestry

- 3. Military Aid ineffective
 - creating instability
 - incite more terrorist attacks

US only - 2/3 - new programs allow them to be independent
old evidence

PFD

FLIP: FC Bacon - Colfax v. DZ Warburton - Wong

Public Forum Debate		Ryan Newman (*CH) <i>Simone Saldana</i> *AH	
Round 6		LL 145	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative DZ	Points (0-20)	Speaker Negative FC
1st	Colfax Warburton	15	1st Colfax 2
2nd	Wong Wong	16	2nd Bacon 1
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 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

First Speaker great job on the delivery of speech. Evidence was good. Cross examination was good. Grandcross fire, debate great job.

Second Speaker great job on speech. Spoke very clear. Evidence was really good. Cross examination was good. Did a really good job on Grandcross fire.

First Speaker excellent job on your speech, delivery clear & persuasive. Evidence was good. Cross examination was great! Grandcross fire was very good.

Second Speaker did a very good job on delivery of your speech. Spoke clear, very organized. Cross examination was good. Questions & answers were great. Excellent job on Grandcross fire.

The reason for my decision is that I thought that they proved their side, the evidence was more believable & stronger. They rebutted their side the best.

PFD

FLIP: AD Relich - Aradhyula v. AG Blecker - Blecker

Public Forum Debate			Wade Jernigan (*DC)		
Round 6			LL 114		Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	③ Aradhyula Aradhyula	16	1st	② Blecker	15.6
2nd	① Relich (slow ③)	17	2nd	④ Blecker	12
The winner of this debate was					
Affirmative Negative			Wade Jernigan		
(Circle Winner)			Judges Signature		
Is this a low point win? _____			Perry High		
			School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Economic Aid 1st
 Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~Character~~

- ① Prioritize -
- ② Development Assistance
- ③ Military Aid -

Speaking fast

- ① "Prevent War"
A NO war, stable

- ② Development Assistance Better
Infrastructure (not weapons)

"off line" cleaner

Prep
:40sec
1:20 prep

Did show Benefit of Aid

- ① 4 min open
- ② 4 min
- ③ 30 sec
- ④ Rebuttle 4 min
- ⑤ 30 sec Rebuttle
- ⑥ 30 sec
- ⑦ 2 min Sum
- ⑧ 2 min Sum
- ⑨ 3 min Grand Cross
- ⑩ 2 min Final Focus
- ⑪ 2 min Final Focus

but didn't show
why not military
1st

COW = Military 1st

~~Catastrophic failure~~ Success

- ① Define Area
- ② Lots of mess & Pain
1.3 million need food

"Economic Assistance does not spur..."

"Aid doesn't help?"

- ① Don't be bullied if you want it to stay keep it.

Pio is "Subjective"

Military and better stop corruption

US Troops = humanitarian Assistance

Con
1:30
:20

700 Terrorists
3000

Nigeria "Economic powerhouse"

- ① Remove instability
- ② Aid Bad


Did not Prove Military 1st

Barclay
DAVENPORT, GABI

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: CN Su - Gilliam v. DO Baduria - Spada

Public Forum Debate			Gabi Davenport (*CC)		
Round 6			LL 263		Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Spada 2	16.5	1st	Su 2	19
2nd	Baduria 1	11.5	2nd	Gilliam 4	18
The winner of this debate was <u>Affirmative</u> Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____			 Judge's Signature Brophy School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD

Primitive means which comes first.
Military Aid comes first but isn't
proven effective. Aff shows is
effective, but dev. aid ~~is~~
provides some stability & can
vote there.

PFD

FLIP: CN Guo - Sun v. DC Garrett - Andrade

Public Forum Debate			Taylor Chen (*AD)		
Round 6			LL 2		Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Garrett 4	18	1st	Sun 2	19
2nd	Andrade 3	18	2nd	Guo 1	19
The winner of this debate was Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____			 Judge's Signature Catherine Foothills School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

→ Good job by both teams, Neg was more convincing that military aid is required for developmental aid to be effective. Negative was more polished in delivery and more effective at responding during cross-X. Aff team effective at demonstrating aid helps with disease/health issues but unable to convince me this can be delivered effectively to an unstable region.

PFD

FLIP: DX Lim - Tang v. CP Ramprasad - Heylman

Public Forum Debate		Chanise McClure (*AK)	
Round 6		LL 106	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Tang	2	1st
		20	Heylman
2nd	Lim	3	2nd
		19	Ramprasad
The winner of this debate was		Judge's Signature	
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒		Binghamt. School	
(Circle Winner)		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 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I vote neg because they give me enough (!) to vote for. Terrorism, drug trafficking, genocide and enough reason to believe they solve. I wanted to vote affirmative the entire round but ya only give me the main impact of children starving and that doesn't at weigh. Aff did better at the end of round ding grand but lost in the F.F. from the

PFD

FLIP: DT Bhatnagar - Wadhwa v. DX Jung - Frehner

Public Forum Debate			Rajan Sheth		
Round 6			LL 221		Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Jung	2 19	1st	Wadhwa	3 18
2nd	Frehner	1 20	2nd	Bhatnagar	4 17
The winner of this debate was			K. S. Sain		
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative			Judge's Signature		
(Circle Winner)			CN		
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 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

ALL
MADE MY
DECISION VERY
DIFFICULT
Jung very passionate

very confident & articulate
gestures motivated & emphasis
very effective

Good support

Fresh Example w/ Somalia

Strong Finish
Good X: maybe
eye contact
w/ opp

Frehner

So nice to understand
your logic & counter points
very well organized &
pertinent to opponents
arguments

Great eye contact
& articulation

X: let them finish answer
before next Q

Really enjoyed
your
2nd!
Wadhwa

Very impressed
w/ your adaptability
& extensive research

good examples haven't heard
yet

good pace (I know you
have a lot to get thru!)

could look up more

X: Know your research well
Excellent!

Good job addressing
all pts

Bhatnagar

Thank you for addressing
"contradiction"

also used fresh examples
hadn't heard yet

YOU BOTH
gave very persuasive
arguments for
what I think
is the more
difficult
argument
Great job!

(T)

(W)

- Dev. help w/ qual life
- military fail
- France ex
- 92 Somalia

1. Drugs
cartels moving into
10% mil & support
2. Kidnappings
\$ mil \$

X: Excellent!

X: 3. cues
Dev aid contributes to

QUALITY OF
LIFE

PRIORITY

(F)

(B)

- peace keep
contradict
no military
- Drugs
2 ex millions
not stop
- Corruption

- observ
- military
- contradiction
- op's case
- dev. aid
- directly
local bureaucrats
- stability
- not hunger
but ideology

PFD

FLIP: DZ Lala - Levitt v. DH Meyer - Sikora

Public Forum Debate			Katherine Lagiglia (*CN) Nicholas Petsas		
Round 6			LL 240		Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Sikora	3	1st	Lala	1
		18			20
2nd	Meyer	4	2nd	Levitt	2
		18			20
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)			Judge's Signature 		
Is this a low point win? Yes			Salpointe / U of A School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1:09 Prep for a 2 min speech?
Yikes.

2:00 Prep for a 2:00 min speech?
Why?

Use more time for the rebuttals
you both need it.

RFD: The Pro won this debate because of their definition of prioritize which said that ~~priority~~ one thing can come before another but if the 2nd thing is more important it's prioritized. At this point that permits the Con's offense that military must come first to protect and therefore the Pro's impacts from malaria focus come into play and win them the round.

PFD

FLIP: CN Han - Foster v. DF Goulet - Bua

Public Forum Debate		Syed Hussain (*DH)	
Round 6		LL 14	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Han (2)	17	1st
2nd	Foster (1)	18	2nd
The winner of this debate was		Negative	
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature Basis Scottsdale Program	
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 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- The have sound argument to justify there cases.
- They have statistical reference to support their cases.

PFD

FLIP: DF Ong - Silva v. CN Rudrapatna - Phan

Public Forum Debate		Reyhan Kader (*DT)			
Round 6		LL 271	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM		
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Rudrapatna 4	16.5	1st	Ong 2	16.5
2nd	Phan 3	16.5	2nd	Silva 1	17
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature  School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>M</u>					

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

TO ALL of YouRudrapatna:

How do I weigh
 Quality of life? What aspects
 Should I weigh first??

Organize your
speech betterOng:

Difference between insurgents
 and terrorists

enunciate please if you go
 fast

Silva:

Don't read successful ml. and
 in your CX! Should have
 been in your rebuttal.

You have a contribution of ml and
 you say of real troops but you
 say let's give them weapons
 when you AT their case with
 corruption speculation!!!

Phan:

Don't throw out short
 term vs. long term if you
 don't tell me how to
 weigh the two

RFD ORAL

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: FK Gilbert - Gowda v. DT Lu - Liu

Public Forum Debate			Judge <u>Chandra</u>		
Round 6			SS 236		Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	<u>Gilbert</u> <u>2</u>	<u>17</u>	1st	<u>Lu</u> <u>1</u>	<u>18</u>
2nd	<u>Gowda</u> <u>3</u>	<u>16</u>	2nd	<u>Lu</u> <u>4</u>	<u>15</u>
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)			 Judge's Signature		
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 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both teams need to show more respect in CX, ~~Answer~~ Answer ~~Uniting~~ Uniting for questions to be answered.

PFD

FLIP: CA Matteotti - Sweat v. CN Ramesh - Wang

Public Forum Debate		Martin Lawrence (*DT)	
Round 6		LL 102	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Ramesh	3 17	1st 2 Sweat
2nd	Wang	1 19	2nd 4 Matteotti
The winner of this debate was		Judge's Signature	
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 Harker 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 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:


~~CX~~ good to have your cards ready.
South Sudan

~~CX~~ don't let him take so much time in ex. one of Ramesh's answers took up a full minute.

Oral A

PFD

FLIP: AG Artigue - Ramaswamy v. DT Bopardikar - Misra

Public Forum Debate		Desiree Srinivas (*CN)			
Round 6		LL 265	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM		
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Bopardikar	15	1st	Ramaswamy	11
2nd	Misra	14	2nd	Artigue	17
		29			28
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)			Hamilton (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 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Bopardikar - very passionate, utilizing pathos appeals with solid arguments, utilizing words like names of diseases to make them stick in your mind. Also, proper eye contact
- Ramaswamy - argument shows more long-term results
- In crossfire, Ramaswamy used "like" a little too much.
 - both successfully questioned and broke down each others' logic
 - some questions posed to be irrelevant
- Artigue frequently asked proof of sources, was able to see where sources were from for argument
- Misra - very passionate argumentation - made best eye contact, spoke well from memory or understanding of topic - addressed Neg. teams lack of answering the corruption address to them in crossfire - looked down a little too much in argument.
- Artigue - began a little too fast, stumbled a little, but was very animated & very passionate - was able to speak off of her paper and use her understanding to explain arguments. - used other teams card during argument - effective, argued it. - broke down one claim made by other team. - showed Malana not in region based on map
- Crossfire - Artigue used "like" a little too much - however, her contention and battle was straight forward - asked for evidence frequently

- Mistra was toral headed during crossfire but was a little overtaken by power of Artigue in debate.
- Bopardikar - more recent examples and ~~examples~~ ^{research} in comparison to other team.
- Ramaswamy - addresses that their research still applies to today, and that Bopardikar's info was simply outdated
- Neg team couldn't give specific # data in regards to impact
- Aff. team looked down a little more during other team discussion
- Neg team doesn't present #'s or tangible impact as far as how far military aid has come to help region - doesn't address the lead to terrorism, or negate the cons of military aid
- Aff team has old research, and some information appears skewed according to Neg. team - saying Neg team can eventually incorporate both.
- decision based more on presentation & effectiveness of both members of team - one was able to provide more tangible evidence, whereas other team asked for evidence more than providing it
 - Artigue was strongest debater, but Aff team had stronger duo, as far as presentation & argumentation
 - Artigue's puns were great - well seasoned debater!

PFD

FLIP: DT Lam - Raghib v. AX Thakar - Saha

Public Forum Debate		Dominic Navalta (*CN)	
Round 6		LL 275	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points	Speaker
1st	Saha	(4) 22 13	1st
2nd	Thakar	(2) 22 15	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒		Judge's Signature	
(Circle Winner)		Hamilton	
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 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff.

Neg.

~~Take~~ Took 2:40 to pull up an evidence card. Evidence should be organized and ready to pull up @ request.

- Spreading.

- Answer the questions asked of you and let the opponent answer your question.

If you don't like the response you get, ask better questions.

- Do not say "anyways, it doesn't matter" to conclude an argument

- Contradicted yourself: huge focus on the Neg only talking about the present, & how that helps you, but then you said you were arguing about the future.

Prep Time: 60 sec
40 sec

+ Good conversational tone
- "Concession that aff. works for the status quo"
- "Default to Neg because Aff didn't win - tie."

Same -

+ Provides infrastructure
+ Won under the framework

This really helped your case. It was a really close round, not because it was a good debate, but because crossfire went to waste.

Prep time: 41 used
14 used
41 used

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

Their concession was your best argument until you contradicted it.

PFD

FLIP: FG Nobby - Dowell v. DK Ramos - Bathla

Public Forum Debate			Gabriel Miller (*AG)		
Round 6			LL 249		Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	1 Ramos	19	1st	3 Nobby	16
2nd	2 Bathla	19	2nd	4 Dowell	17
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? NO					

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Nobby

con

Lots of improvement since I last judged you. Good work.

- Security
 - drugs
 - ex: Afghan failed Aid \$121mi - \$176

- \$ increases corruption
 - [Corruption watch] (Credible source?)
 - WSJ: \$ millions from health, etc.

- \$ detrimental to pop
 - global examples of Antel
 - (?) ↓ 0.59% - civil unrest

"Cat-o".org 1960-95

CA.T.O.

Dowell have suffered drought they need security
\$ 1T Aid in Africa already!
(Income lower than 70's)

this is good! Develop this!

[excellent case Powell]

"trillions" - don't contradict!

World Bank: Failure of 80% no country has a social stance

"worse off" develop your rhetorical vocab 3:05

Dowell Where were you during grand x? You still have 1:15 to prep. Don't use cross for prep

Ramos

Pro

D.A = Public \$

11 million @ risk

- Droughts
 - Econ growth/opportunity
 - ONLY way to help
 - fighting not happening(?) related to conflict
 - climate change (hyperbolic)

- Infrastructure
 - sustain energy, social programs, health, food

Bathla NYT: Poverty root cause of terrorism

Bridge not \$ assistance I disagree, but you both accepted this.

sanction training → coup violence

CNN: Aid promotes growth get a better source for this

Excellent Flowing, Bathla.

Examples of aid, not specific to Sahel, true, but they shed light as an example. con, you need to defend this point

Ramos - "How will military aid solve?"

Excellent idea to call out solvency, Ramos

Yes, the coup example flowed through.

\$1 Dollar a day.

Okay, how much
\$ do they need per
day

1 Dollar a day

OKatz, how much

\$ do they need per day

PFD

FLIP: DT Huang - Chona v. FK Niu - Nagarajan

Public Forum Debate			Kylie Conway		
Round 6			LL 104		Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Vishal Nagarajan 2	19	1st	Joyce Huang 3	17
2nd	Hexin Niu 1	20	2nd	Eesha Chona 4	15
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? ☒ No			 Judge's Signature ASU School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Finally teams who are about evidence!

Overall great CX Q's

Verbal RFD

NEG

Eesha - You have to let them answer even if you feel like their answer isn't an actual answer.

Examples from other parts of the world / continent doesn't make it non-relevant.

PFD

FLIP: AO Curtis - DeTaboada v. FK Conklin - Dong

Public Forum Debate		Mahir Qureshi (*FD)	
Round 6		LL 105	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	3 Conklin	19	1st
2nd	1 Dong	20	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature BASIS 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 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff.

1. Agriculture
 - strong drought resistance
2. Improving govt.
 - reduced level of corruption
3. ~~MA~~ MA is ~~harmful~~ harmful

Neg.

1. MA necessary precursor
 - US accountability office
 - 46000
 - PA is not priority over MA
2. Instability
 - military can stabilize
3. Past Experiences

- points flowed through
- great speaking

- some points were not clear

2000
-54
-47

PFD

FLIP: AO Muddukrishna - Sharma v. AD Mazza - Russell

Public Forum Debate		Kiran Arimilli (*DT)	
Round 6		LL 45	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Anjali Russell	2 19	1st Pavan Muddukrishna 4 18
2nd	Zy Mazza	1 19.5	2nd Nikhil Sharma 3 18
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒		Kiran Arimilli	
(Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>Yes</u>		Harker	
		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- ① The 30 sec. card says in a world w/o conflict otherwise people would withdraw and.
- ② Loss does not flow through & Neg tells me they generate stability & allow access to development and
- ③ Neg tells me that mil is a priority
- ④ Tangible impacts

PFD

FLIP: FD Shah - Hu v. AF Seo - Lawrence


Public Forum Debate		Alex Ackroyd (*CP)	
Round 6		LL 148	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Raj Shah	3	1st
2nd	Alan Hu	4	2nd
		18	
		16	
The winner of this debate was		Points (0-20)	
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 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PFD

FLIP: CH Poole - Brescia v. FC Kelehan - Miller

Public Forum Debate			Matt Anderson (*CA)		
Round 6			LL 272		Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Brescia 3	17	1st	Kelehan 1	18
2nd	Poole 4	16	2nd	Miller 2	17
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 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Negative had the best evidence in the round.
 Remember that I can't weigh an argument or determine which side will have the best outcome without sources or statistics. Both sides needed a lot more logical support for their cases.



(4)✓
(3)✓
(4)✓
(3)✓
(2)✓
(3)✓
(2)✓

JUN, SEO YOUNG

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DC McClure - Martin v. DG Colvin - Okeefe

Public Forum Debate		Seo Young Jun (*CN)			
Round 6		LL 47	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM		
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Colvin	④ 14	1st	McClure	② 14
2nd	Okeefe	② 15	2nd	Martin	① 17
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			Seo Young Jun Judge's Signature HHS School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirmative

- Humanitarian
- Effectiveness
- Security is not as pressing as dev needs
- Terrorism is on decline
- Fails to aid security war aid ≠ peace aid
- Already very dry / fossil fuels / agriculture is not surviving
- 18 mil starving

- UN - Dev is vital / it is primary key to finding peace to extremism
- Efforts of Dev aid in the past proof
- Columbia evidence - drug trade not relevant
- Fossil fuels - overall climactic change

Negative

- Promote security
- Prerequisite to econ/growth
- More direct/efficient/quick
- Brought has been forever
- No stability - highest ^{population} ~~paper~~ terr.
- Mali - success of military aid
- Mil aid first to make dev aid effective
- Past history / evidence of effectiveness (✓+)
- Climate change - not relevant 300%↑
- Why develop first in terr. area

Unprotected assistance would inc ~~ext~~ terr
Build up base of security

- NEG provided concrete evidence and records of history in a more successful way although PRO still did a great job negating the points that the opponents made
- NEG became more convincing when they stressed the higher importance of mil aid rather than sole importance

PFD

FLIP: DT Sahoo - Papakipos v. CN Chew - Diyya

Public Forum Debate		Daryn McClure (*DC)	
Round 6		LL 270	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
<i>RANK</i> 3 ^{1st}	<u>Zoe Papakipos</u>	<u>18</u>	<i>RANK</i> 4 ^{1st}
<i>RANK</i> 1 ^{2nd}	<u>Samali Sahoo</u>	<u>20</u>	<i>RANK</i> 2 ^{2nd}
			<i>RANK</i> <u>Lydia Chew</u>
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 DARYN MCCLURE 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 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEG 2

Pro 2

443 ← Crossfire

443 ← Crossfire

223 ← Crossfire

22

2 min prep

- Dev aid is stolen
- Military aid to remove corruption
- Dev aid & funding to terrorism
- Rule of law corrupt
- People able to fight back & assistance

Response - "doesn't make sense"

Military aid - how does it work?

Reduce terrorism 40%

Libya non-Sahel region

Fragility how fragility is measured

Supply demand of drugs

Neg 1

Pro 1

CROSS FIRE

- Corrupt govt
 - Stolen dev assist
- Worsening danger
 - govt overthrow
 - ↑ crime/drugs
 - religious extremists
- 1288 attacks of terrorism

- MORE DATA
- 1- ↓ Sick people
 - ↓ meningitis
 - 25K deaths
 - 94% reduction
 - HIV/Aids
 - ↓ HIV → ↑ GDP
 - Affordable drugs
 - pregnancy care
 - ↓ illness - ↓ terrorism

MORE

restated shared data

- 2- Rule of Law:
 - ↑ RoFL
 - (criminal justice)

gov't corruption ↓ Rule of Law

- 3- FOREIGN AID/EDU CAPITAL
- Domestic fight against terrorism

- NEED FORCE

military aid: ↑ coups
↑ arms to the region
↑ cyclical corruption

2C PFD 1P

FLIP: DS Carlton - Schieke v. FO Bach - Chung

Public Forum Debate		Joel Underwood (*DD)	
Round 6		LL 149	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Chung 3	18	1st Schieke 2
2nd	Bach 4	16	2nd Carlton 1
The winner of this debate was		Judge's Signature	
Affirmative Negative		DD	
(Circle Winner)		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 or 5.

JUnderwood@seattleacademy.org (flow mailed upon request)

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Wow! Best round of the tournament thus far! Thanks! ☺
- Four - minute speeches were awesome! Both cases are very well constructed. Got a lot in without going to CX speed.
 - 2 minute speeches were a bit all over the road. Roadmap me as to key issues (2 or 3 tops!) then walk me thru.
 - XF periods didn't cover as much ground as I would have liked. Move on if you're not getting the answer and not gonna.
 - Aff 2nd speaker can be a tad aggressive and abrasive. Throttle down a notch or two.
 - Con works the coup angle convincingly, especially in terms of the mandatory aid freeze. CLOSE!!

2min

33, 30, 10

YANG, ROGER

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: CN Maitra - Gupta v. AK Russell - Ferguson

Public Forum Debate		Roger Yang (*DH)	
Round 6		LL 147	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Ferguson ①	20	1st
2nd	Russell ③	18	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		<u>Basis Scottsdale.</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirmative Team

Ms. Ferguson:

Excellent presentation, strong points, strong rebuttal.

Mr. Russell:

very analytical, strong presentation, improvement on rebuttal is needed.

Negative Team

Mr. Gupta

Excellent presentation, very polite, but strong rebuttal, strong points

Mr. Maitra

Excellent questions, strong summary.

Ferguson / Russell

1st

Priority

Development - sustain

Demo

education, poverty

Military - worse.

terror weapons on the ground.

Terrorism - western

② land mine - kill thousands

75

70 people/day (?)

22 countries

military cause this problem

more.

or

Agriculture.

③ Aids

destabilize the region

UCLA - destabilize the military (army)

Cross

land mine - remove mine

Terrorist (How many?)

ODA

2nd Resolutions (good!)

Root cause terrorism (under development)

Priority

Medicine

Imminent threat - Half million

Help - food

1000 peoples

2nd Cross

1st uneducated people

Scale

Gupta / Miatra

1st

Development

①

Without military aid

Northern Mali

corrupted governments

life in dangers

UN cutback

② threat to life

AQIM → Mali

→ terrorism

Vote - jeopardize

✓ (?) military successful.

(AQIM → threat)

Innocent people dies

67000 people

people due to military

over a thousand/year

Stop growing

2nd frame work.

Equal

- UN,

- Infrastructure

- Not

- 1.2 millions lost to the government

△ de-mine - military

Protect the aid delivery

military circum government

1st x scale back.

- military aid fund (How much?) ✓

2nd.

us exponentially

PFD

FLIP: DH Lee - Lee v. CP Saraf - Allen

Public Forum Debate		Kristin Andreatos (*AG)	
Round 6		LL 43	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	H. Lee	3	18
2nd	S. Lee	1	19
The winner of this debate was		Negative	
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		<u>Chaparral / teacher</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

H. Lee: very clear constructive
good initial ? in crossfire

S. Lee: powerful counter points in constructive
very effective 1st ? in crossfire → ~~do not~~ have to just pick 1

weakest pt - ↑ democracy
strongest pt - economic benefits

Allen: spend too long on 1st constructive → would like more evidence in 2nd contention
great response to initial ? in crossfire → both looking to the future

Saraf: a little confusing when it comes to question of having to pick 1 over the other
great passion & very clear final focus

weakest pt - marginalize women
strongest pts - borders, ↑ unity

MAYHOOD, MATT

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DX Ricksecker - Mandolang v. DT Xie - Bashar

Public Forum Debate		Matt Mayhood (*CH)	
Round 6		LL 269	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Bashar	20	1st
2nd	Xie	19	2nd
The winner of this debate was		Negative	
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		Points (0-20) 15 18	
Is this a low point win? _____		Judge's Signature Matthew Mayhood Foothill High School School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Bashar

Mandolang

Great eye contact
Great enunciation
Excellent delivery
Perfect speed

Slow down slightly
Make more eye contact
You did well, but you need to be more confident

Xie

Great speaking,
you spoke clearly,
at times you spoke quickly, but slowed

Ricksecker
- Great delivery
- Good cadence
- Good presence

Both sides did very well. However, the Aff had more examples of how bad it is to have armed military in the region. The Neg had good "what ifs," but no hard evidence of the effects of military in the region.

you were very polite + civil, still arguing, but you argued appropriately. This doesn't happen often anymore

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: AS Pierre - Draper v. CN Ngo - Agarwal

Public Forum Debate		Judge <u>Superman</u>	
Round 6		SS 234	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	<u>Pierre</u> <u>3</u>	<u>18</u>	1st
2nd	<u>Draper</u> <u>2</u>	<u>18</u>	2nd
			Negative
			Points (0-20)
			1st
			<u>Agarwal</u> <u>1</u>
			2nd
			<u>Ngo</u> <u>4</u>
			<u>17</u>
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			
		<u>Jeffrey Kuperman</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 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DD Atkins - Atkins v. CN Bhatti - Ramadoss

Public Forum Debate			Judge <u>Macmillan</u>		
Round 6			COWDN 218		Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	<u>Atkins, C</u>	<u>2</u>	1st	<u>Ramadoss</u>	<u>4</u>
		<u>18</u>			<u>16</u>
2nd	<u>Atkins, L</u>	<u>1</u>	2nd	<u>Bhatti</u>	<u>3</u>
		<u>19</u>			<u>17</u>
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature <u>Dougherty Valley HS Coach/Teacher</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(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 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision: This debate was messy, unorganized, and filled with generalizations. Aff wins on negative impacts from military intervention in Vietnam, Iraq, Afghanistan, which neg largely dropped.

Ramadoss	Atkins, C.	Bhatti	Atkins, L.
MA ≥ DA = Neg win I. MA then DA II. Corrupt Govts prevent aid from helping b. Terror groups growing and expanding - bombing, taking over govt III. DA currently ineffective - outside influences hurting region - HIV, diarrheal deaths	prioritize = treat more import. Military response is more expensive than D.A. Resilience - Gov works on its own Prioritizing DA has long term imp. Military has a govt agenda	Military Aid only needs to go to areas where it's needed	→ Poverty is root of terr. - DA promotes resilience • Pointing a gun at people doesn't make things better - Vietnam, Iraq, Afgh. → French Military currently in Mali, but can't stop unrest II - MA doesn't work (Mali)


PFD

FLIP: DH Cohen - Kovalchuk v. AC Lien - Srinivasan

Public Forum Debate		Mitchell Dyer (*DF)	
Round 6		LL 160	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	<u>Cohen</u>	_____	1st
2nd	<u>Kovalchuk</u>	_____	2nd
The winner of this debate was		<u>No SHOW</u>  Judge's Signature <u>Mesquite</u> 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 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:



PFD

FLIP: AS Mills - Mills v. AG Thorley - Mouti

Public Forum Debate			Kris Callan (*AD)		
Round 6			LL 243		Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Mouti	4 13	1st	S Mills	1 15
2nd	Thorley	3 14	2nd	J Mills	2 16
The winner of this debate was					
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)			Judge's Signature Kris Callan		
Is this a low point win? No			School / Affiliation / Occupation Catalina foothills HS		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision: Neg wins this round because their case was presented more clearly + coherently. They gave good examples of why military aid 1st was beneficial even though they used some examples outside of Sahel regions. Pro failed to show that Dev. Aid without initial military intervention is effective. Mali case with increase in agricultural production is only after securing the govt with French troops.

PRO

- ① DEV. Assistance priority
- Economic
 - Welfare
 - Desperation, root cause of terrorism
 - self-sufficiency
 - Education
 - reduce problems
 - Drug trafficking
 - hunger malnutrition
 - DEV Aid
 - more constructive than milit. Aid

Mali - Gates foundation > crop prod.

CON

DEV. Aid necessary but not without securing areas w/ milit. aid 1st.

Terrorism -

- ① hot-bed, Libyan & Russian weapons
- appeals for military assistance
- ② stability before DEV Aid.

- Afghan Hwy - expensive because of attacks

- Dev assist by itself can't solve problems

Mali - French military secured govt

- AQIM -

Terrorist groups


- Take over govt - Fundamentalism
- Displace people 1.5 million

- ③ Food programs - need peace-keeping
- inefficient
 - stolen

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: DS Fedasiuk - Wakefield v. CO Bryant - Riggs

Public Forum Debate		Judge <u>Tibbets</u>			
Round 6		SS 314	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM		
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	<u>Bryant</u>	<u>2</u>	1st	<u>Wakefield</u>	<u>4</u>
2nd	<u>Riggs</u>	<u>1</u>	2nd	<u>Fedasiuk</u>	<u>3</u>
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
(Circle Winner) ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			<u>GCA</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:


- It's nice to see a different take on an overly predictable resolution.
- I'm not sure if you purposely didn't ask Qs in cross? (Bryant)
- Fun is fun, until it becomes rude.
- maybe it is an AZ/CA difference, but making any noise during another person's speech is rude.
- Don't just drop an entire case.
- wakefield - don't get flustered during cross. Especially when your opponent is staying calm.
- I felt like you spent more time on why their case is bad, but remind me why yours is good in your rebuttal.
- good job holding your own against a tough team.

This was the toughest decision I've ever had to make.

I vote on key voters given. Neg asked me to vote on the issue of conflict returning unless we prioritize military assistance. But they didn't convince me that Military aid would help with the problems with women. Aff asked me to vote on the issue of if we can't fix the women's issue, the world will be never be stable. So why prioritize something (military) if it can never lead to a solution.

PFD

FLIP: CP Khelghati - Mobarhan v. DH Mitina - Chung

Public Forum Debate		Satheesh Aradhyula (*AD)	
Round 6		LL 60	Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker
1st	Mitina 3	18	1st Mobarhan 1
2nd		NA	2nd Khelghanti 2
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature  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 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:


- * Chung did not show up for the debate.
Mitina went max.
- * Con side won 'prioritize' argument.
- * Con side also won corrupt govts argument in that DA is ineffective until we stabilize govts first etc.
- * Con side's argument that past DA led to extensive agriculture land which resulted in ^{all} instability, environmental degradation and therefore, DA is bad is not valid for argued by pro side.
- * All ~~are~~ three are good speakers.

Lincoln
~~DAVIS, NICK~~

2014 ASU Southwest Championship

PFD

FLIP: CC Knight - Shafstall v. AS Freidman - Gummere

Public Forum Debate			Nick Davis Lincoln		
Round 6			LL 109		Sat 01/11/14 08:00AM
Speaker	Affirmative	Points (0-20)	Speaker	Negative	Points (0-20)
1st	Gummere 2	17	1st	Knight 4	15
2nd	Friedman 1	18	2nd	Shafstall 3	16
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)			 Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			Desert Academy School / Affiliation / Occupation		

DO NOT JUDGE ANY TEAM YOU JUDGED IN ROUNDS 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Good clear debate both teams. Con: (Knight, Shafstall) - you need to be much more aggressive in crossfire(s). Have questions ready (same for Gummere).

Decision based on Aff keeping the flow and more evidence to back up your case. Neg needs more evidence. Neg. also dropped some of the Aff. points. Instead of focusing on definition of prioritize, go over all the points. Good arguments Neg - just need warrants more.

Great job Novices - you will be awesome debaters.