


NPF

FLIP: 38 Danciu - Hunt v. 40 Warrior - Exum

Novice Public Forum			Jesus Betancourt (*46)		
Finals			Room 866		Sat 02/11/17 05:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Exum	28	1st	Danciu	26
2nd	Warrior	29	2nd	Hunt	27
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Brophy / Coach School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Pro) Con (Circle Winner)			Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PRO

CON

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

Speaker 1.....	4 min
Speaker 2.....	4 min
Crossfire (1 & 2) *.....	3 min
Speaker 3.....	4 min
Speaker 4.....	4 min
Crossfire (3 & 4) *.....	3 min
Speaker 1 Summary.....	2 min
Speaker 2 Summary.....	2 min
Grand Crossfire (all).....	3 min
Speaker 3 Final Focus.....	2 min
Speaker 4 Final Focus.....	2 min
2 minutes of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

1  
OPW student needs more precedent.

2  
• Good job focusing the cross-fire on why embargo is not a solution  
• Don't let opponents engage in debate in crossfire.

1  
• Case is a little messy, lots of arguments but missing key length.  
• Don't cheer gun in rounds.  
• Not sure if the argument on requirements in the summary is new or not.

2  
• Good organization, but a slight disconnect between what you're arguing and what your partner summarizes.

RFD

Overall, would have liked to see more on whether or not progress has happened because of/in spite in spite of the embargo and if that progress will A) continue to happen and B) take Cuba to where the U.S. wanted it to be when the embargo was placed. A lot of historic context is missing from this.


Both teams jump to impacts without really providing accounts to or links to the impacts.

Round for me hinged on 1) can progress happen w/ the embargo in place or does progress happen because of the embargo and 2) is it legal to lift the requirements?

Ultimately, I think the PRO has shown an ineffectiveness of the embargo and progress happening in spite of the embargo. As well as the fact the legality of lifting could be bought by me because of a lack of direct language saying so from the CON.

# NPF

FLIP: 38 Danciu - Hunt v. 40 Warrior - Exum

Novice Public Forum		Vincent Bai (*20)			
Finals		Room 866	Sat 02/11/17 05:30PM		
Speaker	Pro <sup>Cliff</sup>	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con <sup>klia</sup>	Points (20-30)
1st	Exum	29	1st	Danciu	30
2nd	Warrior	29	2nd	Hunt	29
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
Pro <input type="radio"/> <b>Con</b> <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			<u>Desert Vista / Parent / IT Mgmt</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Gave to the con team.

Felt that in total the con team left ~~some~~ openings which the pro team did not take.

Namely

Q - should we take other countries into account  
 Reply "No other countries inputs are irrelevant" <sup>Comment disagree</sup>  
 why follow that up with question about quality of life in US? ~~the~~ Pro Team had him on the ropes and let him off.

- Con Team said the following without citing anything. <sup>Comment</sup> Challenge it.  
 "Embargo is working" (only thing supporting this stated was the 5% → 25% privatization. and does that mean is working?)
- con said this 5% → 25% means std of living is increasing. based on what data?
- Drugs going down
- If embargo lifted, will be brain drain + people will leave.


Glad that it was cordial  
 Both Teams Great work!

embargo <> immigration Policy

Speaker 1.....	4 min
Speaker 2.....	4 min
Crossfire (1 & 2) *.....	3 min
Speaker 3.....	4 min
Speaker 4.....	4 min
Crossfire (3 & 4) *.....	3 min
Speaker 1 Summary.....	2 min
Speaker 2 Summary.....	2 min
Grand Crossfire (all).....	3 min
Speaker 3 Final Focus.....	2 min
Speaker 4 Final Focus.....	2 min
2 minutes of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

NPF

FLIP: 38 Danciu - Hunt v. 40 Warrior - Exum

Novice Public Forum		Shuyan Hong (*37)			
Finals		Room 866	Sat 02/11/17 05:30PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<del>Danciu</del> Exum	---	1st	<del>Exum</del> Danciu	---
2nd	<del>Hunt</del> Warrior	---	2nd	<del>Warrior</del> Hunt	---
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)			Sources shown to this could have strengthened your case <b>(15)</b>		
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>			School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision

Quality of Life Original Intention

① New Cuban Regime = New Rule & Direction  
 - Liberalize Cuban Econ } happened under embargo so therefore it is working why lift it.  
 - only happening b/c of embargo  
 - removing will remove incentive

② Harms Cuban Advancement  
 - loss of technology  
 - computer co  
 - medical - Obama legalized imports of medical  
 - well being of Cubans  
 - lack access to food & medical  
 - ie. bottled water, medicine

③ Effects on US  
 - cost on American economy  
 - Agriculture  
 - lifting = no harm to US economy  
 - Better research could then come to the U.S.

Human Rights violation decrease? little progress in human rights violation  
 why do you want to go against what ppl of Cuba want?

191 other countries want to lift embargo for 22 years. - evidence?  
 - irrelevant b/c U.S. influence & power so opinion of other countries doesn't matter. - foreign policy?

not meet requirements. Working towards public free/fair voting  
 only 25% = illegal to lift until m  
 only benefit gov no ppl

IFUS A) Strengthen regime gives 1% GDP/year benefit ppl & corrup  
 - validate human rights  
 Allows Cuba for travel - family, business etc. under Obama

Embargo = success meeting demands? - moving towards democracy  
 - freedom ppl in Cuba oppose repeal

Drugs in Cuba #s have plummeted  
 - decrease in human rights b/c embargo increasing in human rights b/c embargo

"Brain Drain" & Refugee Crisis if lift embargo = quality of life  
 - How do you know? Prove

Progress which is what we want, can't just ignore #s of progress when it benefits both US & Cuba  
 Why stop making progress before we are there? - prove using examples of past net benefit = slow and steady democracy

Contradicts that they are working towards more free, fair, democratic gov. Compare to when US has held in UN - go after this!

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min
Speaker 2	4 min
Crossfire (1 & 2) *	3 min
Speaker 3	4 min
Speaker 4	4 min
Crossfire (3 & 4) *	3 min
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min
2 minutes of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

democracy not same thing Constitutional