



# NPF

FLIP: 40 Warrior - Exum v. 35 Pattichis - Struck

Novice Public Forum				Vismay Pandia (*25)			
Round 1		Flight 2		Room 526		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	EXUM		28	1st	<del>Struck</del> STRUCK		28
2nd	WARRIER		29	2nd	PATTICHIS		27
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature  Desert Mountain School / Affiliation / Occupation			
(Pro) Con (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____							

1:27

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Voted that lifting the embargo will positively impact both Cuba and us

## Pro/Con Voting Issues

- Supplied quality of life argument and better solvency
- Argued how Raul/Trump meetings are/will lead to Cuban gov. cooperating with US economy
- Solvency debates → Pro supplied better arguments on how lifting the embargo will lead to econ impacts

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.	

Communist authoritarian

# NPF

FLIP: 30 Felton - Luca v. 20 Storie - Peper

Novice Public Forum				Vismay Pandia (*25)			
Round 1		Flight 1		Room 526		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	Luca		26	1st	Peper		27
2nd	Felton		29	2nd	Storie		28
The winner of this debate was							
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/>				Vismay Pandia			
(Circle Winner)				Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? _____				Desert Mountain			
				School / Affiliation / Occupation			

1:45

1:15

1:30

1:00

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Voted on Tobacco industry will impact quality of life to a greater degree.

Con  
1 min  
30 sec  
5 sec

No emphasis on medicine

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.	

Tobacco

Quality of life

- Wash environmental  $\oplus$  in collective

- Sex tourism

Tobacco



- Make arg  $\rightarrow$  10PT  $\rightarrow$  easier tourism  $\rightarrow$  Sex industry  $\oplus$

- Environmental  $\oplus$   $\rightarrow$  hunting tobacco industry  $\rightarrow$

Will hurt quality of life

# NPF

FLIP: 46 Yin - Mulkem v. 16 Bakshi - Cooley

Novice Public Forum				Julie Lyon (*57)			
Round 1		Flight 1		Room 124		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	Bakshi	4	25	1st	Mulkem	1	26
2nd	Cooley	2	26	2nd	Yin	3	25
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature  School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____							

Comments & Reason for Decision:


Pro could have benefited with additional points other than just the potential benefit to citizens & that they may rise up

Con needs to be careful not to introduce new evidence in Final Focus.

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.	

**NPF**

FLIP: 15 Beltran - Castaneda v. 35 Li - Sheng

Novice Public Forum				Jesus Betancourt (*46)			
Round 1		Flight 2		Room 524		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	Sheng		29	1st	Beltran		26
2nd	Li		24	2nd	Castaneda		25
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
Pro Con (Circle Winner)				Brophy / Coach School/Affiliation/Occupation			
Is this a low point win? _____							

1:10

1:06:22

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1 CON • Good use of examples in your case.	2 CON • You're making extensive in your rebuttal, no response to the PRO.	1 PRO • C3 evidence isn't very strong, and what is the impact?	2 PRO 1. - are you applying PL in the rebuttal? 2. - why are you shutting?
--	---	--	---

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.	


RFD

CON does win the entire argument, Cuba does & has reacted negatively & abused the easing of sanctions. Examples being "out dated" doesn't mean they didn't happen, and does not erase the historical impacts the past leader propagated. However, because there is no proven HR difference with lifting or not lifting the embargo, I have to look to the PRO's economic impact, which wins the round because if Cuba can't stop violating HR they can at least have a better GDP.

PRO get out of here with that second rebuttal solvency press.

# NPF

FLIP: 57 Narayanan - Mooney v. 9 Miller - Lafflam

Novice Public Forum				Jesus Betancourt (*46)			
Round 1		Flight 1		Room 524		Eri 02/10/17 03:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	Lafflam		26	1st	Mooney		28
2nd	Miller		26	2nd	Narayanan		27
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner)				Brophy / Coach School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

26 sec

1	2	1	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Weak dichotomy between your C1 &amp; C2.</li> <li>Could project more while speaking</li> <li>You have good points in the GCF, you should speak up more and apply that thinking to your speeches.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Practice work economy, spending a lot of time to repeat one argument.</li> <li>Rebuttal is a bit disorganized</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Great speaking skills</li> <li>Case is good, but has huge logical leaps, comments need to be stronger</li> <li>Summary was very well done, good job keeping it tight there.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rebuttal was very neat, but there could have been a stronger job applying your impacts.</li> <li>Speak up in crossfire.</li> </ul>

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.	

RFD:

PRO wins the "blame" argument, in that the embargo does allow the Cuban govt. blame the U.S. and allows the Cuban govt. to continue enacting its policies.

However, PRO does not warrant its humanitarian arguments and CON calls this out. PRO also allows the CON to flow through, making it so that in the round 1 have to value a mutual benefit as opposed to a Cuba-only benefit, so CON takes the round there.

# NPF

FLIP: 35 Sanyal - Karim v. 41 Martinez - Yu

Novice Public Forum				Rachel Fromm (*40)			
Round 1		Flight 2		Room 125		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM	
Speaker	<b>Pro</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	<b>Con</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	Martinez		29	1st	Karim		26
2nd	Yu		29	2nd	Sanyal		25
The winner of this debate was				<del>Rachel Fromm</del>			
<b>Pro</b> Con (Circle Winner)				Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? <u>N</u>				DU HS teacher			
				School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**PRO**

Economy didn't change  
 - health meds needed  
 - military if not lifted.

**CON**

- solidifies cuban regime  
 - cigars harmful  
 - drugs trade will be stopped

- Awesome presence & tone

- Speak slowly, not as loud, let other speaker finish first.

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.	

IN favor of **PRO** because of their point that this embargo is already not working why should it work now?  
 Military = scary, we shouldn't risk it.

# NPF

FLIP: 25 Pandia - Ashworth v. 30 Matejsek - Stabilito

Novice Public Forum			Rachel Fromm (*40)		
Round 1		Flight 1	Room 125	Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM	
Speaker	<b>Pro</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	<b>Con</b>
1st	Arshar Pandia		26	1st	Emily Stabilito
2nd	Kyle Ashworth		27	2nd	Rachel Matejsek
The winner of this debate was			Rachel Fromm Judge's Signature PMS teacher School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner)			Is this a low point win? <u>W</u>		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Arshar, PRO  
 - slow down, speak loudly

Rachel, CON  
 - breathe, but good enunciation.

- ① increase unempl. rates
- ② hurts citizens
- ③ U.S. scapegoat


- ① detrimental
- ② only feeds \$ to their gov - not ppl.
- ③ democracy

Con won because of their argument Cuba gas to gov not citizens.

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: 15 Hatch - Clarke v. 19 Epstein - Brown

Novice Public Forum				Mikkaela Salamatina (*5)			
Round 1		Flight 2		Room 525		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	Hatch	3	24	1st	Brown	2	24.5
2nd	Clarke	4	23.5	2nd	Epstein	1	25
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Monave High School School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PRO	CON
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Obama isn't POTUS anymore...</li> <li>• Rebuttal could've spent a lot more time on CON instead of just reaffirming PRO</li> <li>• at NO point in debate do you actually emphasize impacts</li> <li>• work on whispering more quietly</li> <li>• Did you preview your summary?</li> <li>• you really didn't create any clash in the round.</li> <li>• Spent &lt;20secs NOT on your case (ON the CON).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• work on fluency</li> <li>• try to come up w/ basic Qs that will support your case</li> <li>• good job w/ economy point / turn on Aff</li> <li>• some of the great questions you asked are actually what you should've said in rebuttal</li> <li>• ie Black Market</li> <li>• In summary, you didn't need to go through your first points the way you did.</li> </ul>


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.	

RFD:



# NPF

FLIP: 8 Tribby - Perez v. 35 Li - Wang

Novice Public Forum				Mikkaela Salamatina (*5)			
Round 1		Flight 1		Room 525		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	Tribby	4	21.5	1st	Wang	1	23
2nd	Perez	3	22	2nd	Li	2	22.5
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Mohave High School School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

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.	


Pro	Con
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WORK ON being a stronger speaker</li> <li>• don't need to off-time Roadmap if just attacking opponent</li> <li>• all of the attacks in rebuttal were purely defensive</li> <li>• don't need to go over defs @ beg. of summary</li> <li>• Summary didn't have time to hit key voters → those should be priority #1</li> <li>• WORK ON being more aggressive in Grand CX</li> <li>• you shouldn't roadmap FF, it's too short (unless you really have reason to do so)</li> <li>• The FF was more of a rebuttal than a FF.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lack of impacts in constructive speech</li> <li>• whisper friendly if you're talking during an opponent's speech</li> <li>• so work on <u>energy</u></li> <li>• thank you for doing votes</li> <li>• there was potential to create a lot of clash w/ econ args + you didn't go for it</li> <li>• Summary is meant to summarize how the round is breaking down. Neither of you did that.</li> </ul>

you don't have to keep asking.

RFD: Con ultimately provided stronger, supported reasons for keeping the embargo.

# NPF

FLIP: 19 Brass - Davidoff v. 38 Danciu - Hunt

Novice Public Forum				BrieAnna Frank (*21)			
Round 1		Flight 2		Room 121		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	Danciu	1	28	1st	Brass	4	22
2nd	Hunt	2	26	2nd	Davidoff	3	24
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Maysale HS School / Affiliation / Occupation			
(Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro had rebuttals + citations. Both had good points but I was more convinced by Pro.

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.	

Davidoff - good confidence in your points.

Danciu - thank you for good eye contact + citations!

Brass - good info, but try to have more confidence - you're

Hunt - good voice + good eye contact. Thanks for shaking my

Pro - lift embargo

Con - don't lift - hands

- embargo fails to help
- not achieved any goals
- China deal not relevant to debate
- driving S. America away from US

- #1 - Cuba hasn't met requirements
- Cuba can't build up military + start wars
- 1988 - Cuba sends traps to Angola

- #2 - harms small businesses
- anti-focus on human rights
- #3 - holding back US economy
- have you help us?
- avoid interacting?
- 20 bil. ag. markets
- embargo costs US \$
- US largest GDP in world
- large corporations won't validate regime - we trade w/ China even though we don't agree w/ them.


- larger economy = more military
- different era - USSR controlling Cuba to repressive regime, not the people
- anti-humanitarian
- China deal not relevant for debate
- hasn't met requirements of democratic govt.
- age of Maoist revolutions over
- hypothetical,
- contradiction - exec order is/isn't relevant

- Don't mention how lifting embargo will help human rights

- If it hasn't succeeded yet, it will never succeed.

NPF

FLIP: 19 Mick - Weiss v. 47 Chou - Zhang

Novice Public Forum				BrieAnna Frank (*21)			
Round 1		Flight 1		Room 121		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	Zhang	4	24	1st	Weiss	3	25
2nd	Chou	2	26	2nd	Mick	1	28
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Manuale HS School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

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.	

Both had good arguments, but Con was more consistent, cited more sources, and speakers were stronger.  
 Weiss - great info + rebuttal  
 Zhang - great info, but slow down a little + speak up. Also, try to look up instead of just reading off the paper.

Mick - thank you for speaking loudly + clearly! Good job at listening their points.  
 Chou - Great passion, but slow down a little, remember to be polite + respectful to opponents during crossfire.



- Contradiction - Some change / no change
- limits trade products from US
- trade of medicine improves mortality numbers
- increase in economy
- 9.5% - From what source?
- Castro has reduced size of govt
- relies on imports to help citizens
- replace embargo w/ ways to help them improve
- only purpose is to oppress people

- shouldn't lift Cuba embargo (not resolved)
- US already sends medical care
- Cuba isn't moving toward demo. gov
- human rights abuses
- good reports arbitrary detentions
- violate US constitution
- 8th Amend - cruel + unusual
- precedent - Vietnam + China haven't changed.
- open trade would help.
- ending embargo = nothing changes
- Cuba needs US more than we need them
- money would go to corrupt govt + not help people

no rebuttal (not resolved)

# NPF

FLIP: 9 Carney - Olson v. 43 Rahman - Velu

Novice Public Forum				Leah Veschio (*11)			
Round 1		Flight 2		Room 522		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	Velu		27	1st	Olson		28
2nd	Rahman		28	2nd	Carney		29
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)				 School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Velu (Pro)  
 1. sugar  
 2. \$  
 3. rail line to lifting embargo  
 good points

Olson (Con)  
 1. affects citizens - Politics  
 2. trade / currency  
 great arguments - nice job

CF#1: PRO - cross fire is tough - it gets easier as you do more debates

Rahman: extremely articulate. Excellent speaker voice. Once she got going she made great points / arguments.

Carney (Con) - LA Times -? watch your citations - Huffington Post  
 are these news story accurate? or just an opinion  
 you did a great job - argued points well

CF#2 Rahman / Carney - well done on both sides

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.	

Pro Con  
 111  
 All

over

over

FLIP: 9 Frindell - Reaves v. 5 Callies - Diaz

NPF

Novice Public Forum				Leah Veschio (*11)			
Round 1		Flight 1		Room 522		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	Diaz		27	1st	Reaves		28
2nd	Callies		29	2nd	Frindell		27
The winner of this debate was				Leah Veschio			
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner)				Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				Basu / RW School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro - Diaz

2. HC issues - Cuba, adv. in H.C. -  
 Univ CA - Havana

Good opening -> well cited

Con: Reaves =

1. C Δ in Pol. System -
2. trade Cuba <sup>people</sup> wouldn't benefit from trade

- Citation from - 80's? = asking to round point  
 - asking to use their (Pro) framework

CF

- Good pt - Con about how prostitution is affected by embargo.

- Con won crossfire - great questions.

Pro - Callies - good speaker - felt you could have said more @ your speech - to argue their pts - instead of focusing on how you want to throw out their point #1

Con - at the other team throw you off your game w/ all their tactics - like throwing out your points or trying to use their framework - their done that to confuse you


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.	

P/C  
 11/11

over

# NPF

FLIP: 58 Campbell - Harris v. 57 Lyon - Ravi

Novice Public Forum				Nienke Onneweer (*41)			
Round 1		Flight 2		Room 527		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	H		26	1st	L		28.6
2nd	C		25	2nd	R		27.6
The winner of this debate was							
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)				Judge's Signature: 			
Is this a low point win? _____				School / Affiliation / Occupation: <u>Mesquite 41</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

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.	

HG - your point that their C2 does not stand... does not stand money is finite, but they choose where it goes.


L2 - for being your first time, you did really well.

Both - date your sources

RFD - In rebuttal/crossfire, con created better arguments. However, it was REALLY CLOSE.

# NPF

FLIP: 1 Hladik - Kodyte v. 21 Sandoval - Preciado

Novice Public Forum				Nienke Onneweer (*41)			
Round 1		Flight 1		Room 527		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	S		23	1st	R		27
2nd	P		25	2nd			27
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Mesquite 41 School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

SP- 54% argument is weak  
 - use more sources  
 - History class was weak  
 - be more prepared, please


HL - speak so I can understand  
 - more successful in crossfire by a mile

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.	

R.F.D: Con clearly had more successful arguments + did well in crossfire.

# NPF

FLIP: 46 Prouty - Heyman v. 1 Raola - Tandon

Novice Public Forum				Lamar Hunt (*38)			
Round 1		Flight 2		Room 123		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Norman</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>27</u>	1st	<u>Tandon</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>26</u>
2nd	<u>Prouty</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>24</u>	2nd	<u>Raola</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>23</u>
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature <u>Basis Parsons / Parsons / Medical Sales</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation			
(Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>HN</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro was able to stay on point and hold off  
 Rebuttals. Con didn't do enough to read their case.


### 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.	



# NPF

FLIP: 25 Sriram - Sriram v. 26 Vega - Volk-Tuller

Novice Public Forum				Lamar Hunt (*38)			
Round 1		Flight 1		Room 123		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	VEGA	3	22	1st	AR. SRIRAM	1	27
2nd	Volk-Tuller	4	20	2nd	AR. SRIRAM	2	26
The winner of this debate was Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con <input type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)				Judge's Signature  BASIS PEORIA/PARENT/MEDICAL SVCS School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>							


Comments & Reason for Decision:

Opening round strongest by pro was rebuttal  
 Pro counterpicks own argument in later round  
 Con was more concise and on point.

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.	

# NPF

FLIP: 5 Salamatin - Boyd v. 20 Lenhart - Rascon

Novice Public Forum				Christine Thiele (*58)			
Round 1		Flight 2		Room 523		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	Salamatin, Carissa		28	1st	Rascon, Allison		29
2nd	Boyd, Dylan		28	2nd	Lenhart, Brooke		28
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Arcadia High School School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>							



Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both teams equally argued human rights contention. Pro team effectively argued their contention 3 about the Truman Doctrine and ~~have~~ presented a valid argument about lessening of ties w/ "USSR" when it fell, but neglected con teams argument about asylum granted by Cuban government to criminals. Both teams are very good and well spoken. Both teams equally argued benefits of medical aid and advancement.

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: 36 Cole - Sainjusmat v. 46 Durado - Perez

Novice Public Forum				Christine Thiele (*58)			
Round 1		Flight 1		Room 523		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	Durado, Chus		27	1st	Cole, Avery		26
2nd	Perez, David		27	2nd	Sainjusmat, Octavia		23
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature  School / Affiliation / Occupation			
(Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>							


Comments & Reason for Decision:

Con team forfeited time in every round and did not attack or comment on contention 2.  
 Pro team proved both contentions, attacked con contentions and showed, illustrated ~~take~~ lack of evidence for cons own contentions.

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: 35 Gadiyar - Shih v. 25 Schur - Reingold

Novice Public Forum				Aiyana Bonnichsen (*20)			
Round 1		Flight 2		Room 521		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	Reingold	4	26	1st	shih	2	28
2nd	Schor	3	24	2nd	Gadiyar	1	28
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Catalina Foothills School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:


1) US agriculture will thrive, exports will increase, grow markets in Cuba  
 2) Perishable US goods, lower transit cost  
 Modest lifting already has led to significant increase  
 1418 new US jobs  
 3) Other countries have rendered this for 24 years. 98% want the US to lift embargo, better international relations  
 Limited lifting has already shown significantly positive effects  
 we could show other countries that we are listening  
 Businesses will profit in both money and jobs  
 US and Israel abstaining from UN vote, shame,  
 Cuba has started to pay off debts, ahead of time  
 Embargo was not put in effect for human rights violations  
 No evidence from other countries about economy "overheating"  
 Govt not confident in UN vote

1) Removing embargo will not improve democracy, will send wrong message, Embargo is our only leverage, reform is already underway  
 2) Economy may grow at an unstable rate, and harmful triggering recession. Current reform  
 3) Middle east power vacuum  
 Lifting embargo would not benefit, current restrictions do not apply to medical and agriculture  
 - No current bans effect agricultural or medical - TSA  
 Opening up trade would mean dealing with a deadbeat nation, US would have to write off debt.  
 Devastating to US tourist industries and economy in Gulf area  
 Castro regime has had massive human rights violation!  
 Venezuelan economy shows effect of overheating  
 Russia had to write off massive debts  
 Current embargo is our leverage

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: 35 Choi - Sung v. 16 Xin - Stevens

Novice Public Forum				Aiyana Bonnichsen (*20)			
Round 1		Flight 1		Room 521		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	Choi	1	28	1st	Stevens	3	26
2nd	Sung	2	28	2nd	Xin	4	26
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Cataline Foothills School / Affiliation / Occupation			
(Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1) Lifting benefits both huge economic loss for US  
 2) Involence change to dem govt  
 3) Biotech advancements, medical benefits to US


Govt raised taxes,  
 Venezuela experiencing crisis, unable to continue to support Cuba is opportunity  
 Raul is different than Fidel, now willing to change. 75% citizens want democracy.  
 US will benefit 10 billion dollars  
 Lifting will benefit Cuban economy  
 US dollars going in will benefit citizens even if paid in pesos  
 US losing money,  
 Embargo creates environment of isolationism  
 Biotech benefits US healthcare system  
 US does not have access to medical  
 with embargo, govt will resist change, list it and makes a claim if for them to change USD to pesos argument makes no sense

D provides us with leverage for better Human Rights  
 2) Helps oppressive regime currency flow will go to govt  
 50% money held by govt  
 Impact on US would be very small  
 Economic problems stem from Cuban govt, not the embargo  
 Tourism & trade will only benefit govt, people still have taxes, citizens will not benefit  
 Other citizens/countries currently can visit, no change to govt practices  
 We already have access to medical/biotech  
 Govt will use money to continue oppressing people, slave labor  
 Govt takes US dollars, but pays in pesos, Embargo forces Cuba to change their human rights  
 US only loses 432 million, negligible effect on economy  
 Tourism benefits will decrease over time

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 Vasquez - Galan v. 11 Hess-Neustadt - Mushro

Novice Public Forum		Emily Su (*35)					
Round 1		Flight 1		Room 528		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM	
Speaker	<b>Pro</b> 1	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	<b>Con</b> 2	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	Hess - Neustadt +		25	1st	Vasquez		28
2nd	Mushro		<del>25</del> 25	2nd	Galan		28
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)				Hamilton School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? <u>w</u>							

1:30

Comments & Reason for Decision:

oral RFD given

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.	