

NPF

FLIP: 5 Salamatín - Boyd v. 19 Brass - Davidoff

Novice Public Forum		Howard Peterson (*25)	
Round 2	Flight 1	Room 524	Fri 02/10/17 05:30PM
Speaker	<u>Pro</u>	Points (20-30)	Speaker <u>Con</u> Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Salamatín</u>	<u>21</u>	1st <u>David Hoff</u> <u>24</u>
2nd	<u>Boyd</u>	<u>23</u>	2nd <u>BRASS</u> <u>25</u>
The winner of this debate was		<u>Howard Peterson</u> Judge's Signature <u>Teacher DY HS</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Pro <u>Con</u> (Circle Winner)		Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

moral obligations
 Cuba Study group not effect.
 Harms Citizens
 Prostitution to live
 1/2 nutritional needs
 Debt to Russia
 100000 B of oil daily
 Health care issues
 who made invest
 missing cancer treat
 of Brain cancer.
 matter of life & death
 Truman Doctrine Hence US Sec.
 repress etc 9940 -

CON
 Emb Keeps from
 expansion.
 kept that way.
 Build mil to
 infringe on neighbor
 1988 - article
 Support spread
 money to repress due
 to terrorism.
 will not support
 the people.
 not met the needs
 of Sec 201
 205 states the needed steps.
 catalyst need the med

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1.....	4 min - 3:56
Speaker 2.....	4 min - 3:40
Crossfire (1 & 2) *.....	3 min ✓
Speaker 3.....	4 min - 3:56
Speaker 4.....	4 min - 3:57
Crossfire (3 & 4) *.....	3 min →
Speaker 1 Summary.....	2 min - 2:10
Speaker 2 Summary.....	2 min - 1:55
Grand Crossfire (all).....	3 min
Speaker 3 Final Focus.....	2 min - 1:57
Speaker 4 Final Focus.....	2 min
2 minutes of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

meds will not be misused By
 MIL.
 they will not be trusted

wash office (of?)
 what was cuba's action due to Sandróns
 Prior to USSR lack of \$.
 1998 dep. not a sig mil. threat.
 Cuba trades w/ 198 others.
 does not (Emb) reduce the military
 F. Cast said they are dem. State
 off terror list

Reb: not imp in the reus in latin
 amer.
 Give them \$ to become a threat.
 1975 troops to angola.
 # of countries that trade w/ US Econ.
 could make more wase here in
 HR.
 we do help as a catalyst to make
 more demo.

NPF

FLIP: 15 Hatch - Clarke v. 30 Matejsek - Stabilito

Novice Public Forum			Howard Peterson (*25)		
Round 2		Flight 2	Room 524	Fri 02/10/17 05:30PM	
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Hatch	21 20	1st	Stabilito	25
2nd	Clarke	24	2nd	Matejsek	25
The winner of this debate was			Howard Peterson Judge's Signature		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)			Teacher DMHS School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Is this a low point win? NO					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro

Done nothing but harm US Econ.

affi
1 22 UN has voted to lift 180 agree.

allies & status of all states of the reg have not been met.
Obama states we need to change the method

Med
Trade
2011 50% of Meds due to emb.
1.4 / 1.8 Bill 1055.
lift they can no longer blame the US.

Cuba not met but met a long time ago.
Cubans must have time to overcome the system.
Med & food care inaccess now.
not help cit. but help God.

US

1. to win must lift now

1. Money to Cuba will suppt.
• wash Post 2016 90% run by state 2015 all pro are the gov.

• Rights zero case
The cross Castro has not budget.
oppressive

continue repression
is leverage power to keep a new policy
1996 - Sanctions to a demo Cuba can be suspended.
will supply Aid Med. etc
• 2016 Econ necessity to reduce mil.

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.	

-3:15
-4:00

-2:00

Human Rights 104.7 mil w/o any imports.
no way to assure that HR vis. will stop.
last year stats (from?)

Kunasek, K (9)
~~DISIMONE, LUKE~~

BASIS Peoria

Bobcat Bonanza 2017

NPF

FLIP: 38 Vasquez - Galan v. 25 Adelberg - Callahan - Desert Mtn
 Steven Ryan

Novice Public Forum		Luke DiSimone (#46) Kim Kunasek (9)	
Round 2	Flight 1	Room 522	Fri 02/10/17 05:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker *Con DM Points (20-30)
1st	Manuel Vasquez	27	1st Ryan Callahan 27
2nd	Adrian Galan Vasquez Galan	28	2nd Steven Adelberg 28
The winner of this debate was		<p>Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/></p> <p>(Circle Winner)</p> <p>Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u></p>	
		<p>Kim Kunasek Judge's Signature</p> <p>Chaparral / Parent / Attorney School / Affiliation / Occupation</p>	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro ^{lift embargo}

Con DM ^{keep embargo}

health concerns
 impact pregnant women
 subjugate cuban people

Speaker 1
 unconst
 as legal free
 harm relationship
 cruel - arrests, detainees,
 no due process

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.	

no desire to control

persuasive argument
 about basic decency
 toward cubans,
 encouraging better
 health + commerce

Steven - very strong speaker
 quick on feet

Ryan - good enthusiasm, sincerity

Both teams very
 strong crossfire

convincing case
 for not having
 met conditions
 and not
 acting w/ii
 legal framework

Adrian - very good
 grasp of
 rules of debate

Manuel - good job, slow
 down 😊

Ryan / Steven / Adrian
 each

2

Basis Pecria
 NPF
 FLIP: 38 Danciu - Hunt v. 35 Li - Wang → Hamilton

Novice Public Forum		Luke DiSimone (#46) → Kim Kunasek (9)			
Round 2	Flight 2	Room 522	Fri 02/10/17 05:30PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Kevin Li</u>	<u>26</u>	1st	<u>Mark Danciey</u>	<u>28</u>
2nd	<u>John Wang</u>	<u>27</u>	2nd	<u>Drew Hunt</u>	<u>27</u>
The winner of this debate was			_____ Kim Kunasek Judge's Signature _____ Chaparral/parent/attorney 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.	

24 sec
56 sec

Pro lift it

13 sec

Con do not lift

Kevin #2

very good speaker
 (read from computer entirely)
 I like the pace of his speaking voice + cadence

John #4

very dramatic style
 seems genuinely convinced of position of economic benefit

Mark #1

very strong speaking voice/skill
 great eye contact with judge

Drew #3

very systematic
 went through pro contentions
 slow down just a bit sometimes

both did excellent job of not reading from notes, only looking occasionally

Democracy/Legal Issues
 Human Rights

STRONG emphasis on economics

(BASIS Pecria)

NPF

FLIP: 26 Vega - Volk-Tuller v. 15 Beltran - Castaneda

Novice Public Forum		Chris Lee (*35)	
Round 2	Flight 1	Room 521	Fri 02/10/17 05:30PM
Speaker	Pro 1	Points (20-30)	Speaker
1st	<u>Volk-Tuller</u>	<u>24</u>	1st <u>Beltran</u>
2nd	<u>Vega</u>	<u>24</u>	2nd <u>Castaneda</u>
<p>The winner of this debate was</p> <p><input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con</p> <p>(Circle Winner)</p> <p>Is this a low point win? <u>no</u></p>		<p><u>Chris Lee</u></p> <p>Judge's Signature</p> <p>School / Affiliation / Occupation</p>	

200
-90
1.30
30
1.00

200
-90
30
1.30
1.00


Comments & Reason for Decision:

*in an ideal
circumstances and
debate
also did not direct /
directly
well.*

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: 16 Xin - Stevens v. 25 Sriram - Sriram

Novice Public Forum		Chris Lee (*35)			
Round 2		Flight 2		Room 521	
				Fri 02/10/17 05:30PM	
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Stevens</u>	<u>27</u>	1st	<u>Sriram</u>	<u>29</u>
2nd	<u>Xin</u>	<u>27</u>	2nd	<u>Sriram</u>	<u>28</u>
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>			School / Affiliation / Occupation		

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.	

Handwritten notes:

CON - better at explaining their points / arguments

PRO - didn't respond to the attack made by con.

Handwritten scores on the right margin:


2.00
- 30
- 15
- 45
- 15
- 60
- 1.00

Handwritten scores on the left margin:

2.00
- 37
- 1.00

NPF

FLIP: 5 Callies - Diaz v. 57 Lyon - Ravi

Novice Public Forum		Benjamin Ladick (*47)			
Round 2	Flight 2	Room 123	Fri 02/10/17 05:30PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>LYON</u>	<u>27</u>	1st	<u>DIAZ</u>	<u>25</u>
2nd	<u>RAVI</u>	<u>26</u>	2nd	<u>CALLIES</u>	<u>26</u>
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature <u>Basis Feonta</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Speaker 1 economic devastation
 American business lost.
 8-1% decrease of employment.
 money doesn't go to public.
 can increase natural
 disaster. Sandy lives. Cubans
 are looking for investors, oil
 field.

Speaker 2 tourism.
 American has no right.
 bankrupt economy.
 Cuban economy.
 Cuba use embargo as escape.

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.	

Require change,
 economy.


1.2 million loss
 morally, legally bound *

Speaker 2
 -tourism increase local
 industry. no boon in con
 world. trade with Cuba
 beneficial for both nations.
 embargo should lifted
 if we neglect the law. It's
 about intl law. done
 nothing so far.

Speaker 2. morally lift the embargo?
 Economic gain or loss? hurt people.
 natural disaster relief help US?
 few reason you can go Cuba?
 we must lift the embargo? US
 prohibits it. State own.
 74% moving away from communism

NPF

FLIP: 21 Sandoval - Preciado v. 20 Lenhart - Rascon

Novice Public Forum		KDee Heath (*16)			
Round 2	Flight 1	Room 526	Fri 02/10/17 05:30PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Sandoval</u>	<u>22</u>	1st	<u>Rascon</u>	<u>26</u>
2nd	<u>Preciado</u>	<u>23</u>	2nd	<u>Lenhart</u>	<u>24</u>
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature <u>16</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <u>Con</u> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PRO

Sandoval - slow, not very confident, please print out speech if you aren't using a laptop, very quiet, speech didn't have structure (made it hard to follow)

Preciado - not very confident, very quiet, very halting & contradictory

CON

Rascon - very clear, a little quiet, more passion, if you have a subpoint 1 you need a subpoint 2 as well (or there's no point)


Lenhart - confident, quiet, a lot of contradictions, didn't address all of the Pro's points

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 definitely contradicted selves a lot more (especially with the travel vs trade ban). Con, make sure you address all of your opponent's' points. Pro repeated selves a lot and did not address a lot of the Con's arguments.

NPF

FLIP: 58 Campbell - Harris v. 35 Choi - Sung

Novice Public Forum		KDee Heath (*16)			
Round 2		Flight 2	Room 526		Fri 02/10/17 05:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Campbell</u>	<u>26</u>	1st	<u>Choi</u>	<u>27</u>
2nd	<u>Harris</u>	<u>25</u>	2nd	<u>Sung</u>	<u>24</u>
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature <u>16</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con					
(Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro

Campbell - good volume, confident, a little dispassionate

Harris - good volume, not a lot of confidence

Con

Choi - good volume, passionate, confident

Sung - good volume, need to emunciate more


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.	

Con, try to balance how much you attack or defend in each speech. Also, let your opponents ask questions in crossfire! Pro didn't really address the Con's specific attacks and just repeated their original points. Also, Pro did not address the drug trade point (except for the Cuban cigars)* Con, TSRA point is strong but you didn't provide evidence of its effects

*also interesting to note, travelers to Cuba from us can buy Cuban cigars and bring them back into the US (currently)

NPF

FLIP: 35 Gadiyar - Shih v. 9 Carney - Olson

Novice Public Forum			Jacqueline Ryan-Rojas, PhD (*36)		
Round 2		Flight 1	Room 124	Fri 02/10/17 05:30PM	
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Olson	23	1st	Shih	28
2nd	Carney	25 27	2nd	Gadiyar	30
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Valley Vista HS / Coach - Speech & Debate School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____					

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.	

~~Olson - slow down, look up more, lots of detail is lost with speed. End of intro was at a better speed.~~
 Olson - slow down, look up more, lots of detail is lost with speed. End of intro was at a better speed.

Shih - slightly slower than Olson, but the speed of detail is present. Details are read with passion - it is easier to follow.

Shih good crossfire "How does democracy go down 30%?"
 Olson good response to health care question.

Carney - Good eye contact. I am able to follow your argument 46 | 30
 *starting to speed up... Strong finish human lives 41 | 30
matter

Gadiyar - Strongest speaker. No need to ~~be~~ shout - but I love the passion. It is ~~impressive~~ impressive that you are able to talk about the topic with memorized knowledge.


Crossfire - Wonderful exchange of ideas! Great questions!
~~Olson - Are you arguing that lifting the embargo is a good thing because then Cuba couldn't blame the US for...?~~

Olson - Are you arguing that ~~lifting~~ lifting the embargo is a good thing because ~~then~~ then Cuba couldn't blame the US for...?
 Shih - Very passionate and clear. Each contention was addressed and negated.

Final Thoughts: Both teams showed strengths. In both cases the argument was supported with detail from research however the con team was more comfortable with their case, and presented better arguments.

NPF

FLIP: 20 Storie - Peper v. 46 Prouty - Heyman

Novice Public Forum			Jacqueline Ryan-Rojas, PhD (*36)		
Round 2		Flight 2	Room 124	Fri 02/10/17 05:30PM	
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Peper	27	1st	Heyman	28
2nd	Storie	28	2nd	Prouty	30
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Valley Vista HS Coach - Speech & Debate School Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)			Is this a low point win? _____		

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.	

~~Heyman~~ Heyman - Good speed - some contention evidence seems over reaching... Hezbollah?

Peper - Look up. It is hard to follow your argument when you read without passion - make a connection with the judge.

Crossfire - full time used. Good questions about economy and business

Prouty - Passionate about your points - good rebuttals, lot of negative ideas about Cuba and fears about lifting embargo

Storie - The argument is "nothing has changed... so why not? Sending aides is a good argument. Stay with human rights - take the moral stand.

Crossfire - Human right violation discussion, free market & Capitalist sentiment.

9-1:12
29 sec

Heyman - ~~Pro~~ Pro did not address framework. "We don't know that free trade is going to happen" Cuba is our enemy

Peper - Human Rights - framework was not attacked by Con

Grand Cross - Good debate!

Prouty - military & drug trade not addressed by Pro
* Capitalism doesn't lead to democracy.

Storie - aide groups was not addressed by Con.
• Almost had it but then you said "and many more reasons" what other points did you want to make?

Final Thoughts: This is a tough one guys. Both teams are strong. Con team began more confident and strong at the beginning but Pro team picked up steam towards the 2nd half.

~~ANDREATOS, KRISTIN~~

Stalk, Jachyn

NPF

FLIP: 36 Cole - Sainjusmat v. 8 Tribby - Perez

Novice Public Forum		Kristin Andreatos (#9) Jachyn Stalk (JS)	
Round 2	Flight 1	Room 523	Fri 02/10/17 05:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker Con Points (20-30)
1st	Tribby	25	1st Cole 24
2nd	Perez	27	2nd Sainjusmat 23
The winner of this debate was			
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner)		Jachyn Stalk Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		Hamilton School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The debate came down to weighing obligation to the U.S. citizens and following national law and an obligation to honor the 1996 Embargo Act as well as the lives of political prisoners. The Con had the potential to win, but a few key flaws in the Pro's argument were not mentioned. The Pro, however, asserted that the embargo did not do anything productive in the 60 years that it had been in place, so removing it would do the United States some economic gain, most notably in the agricultural sector. The Con's single solid card of the U.S. adhering to the Embargo Act is weaker in comparison. Thus, I vote 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.	

NPF

Stark, Jacyln

FLIP: 43 Rahman - Velu v. 11 Hess-Neustadt - Mushro

Novice Public Forum		Kristin Andreatos (20)		Jacyln Stark (35)	
Round 2		Flight 2		Room 523	
				Fri 02/10/17 05:30PM	
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Velu	23	1st	Mushro	24
2nd	Rahman	26	2nd	Hess-Neustadt	27
The winner of this debate was			Jacyln Stark		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/>			Judge's Signature		
(Circle Winner)			Hamilton		
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The Con called out the Pro's fallacies in the ho arguments. The ho made a slippery slope argument ~~beginning~~ with a wild claim that lifting the embargo on Cuba will decrease rate of obesity. The Pro rebutted Con's human rights value by saying that the embargo affects only the govt, not the people. However, the Con had evidence to support that the embargo was giving people more opportunity to move toward democracy. The embargo is helping human rights, and the cause of embargo was a violation of human rights. Although the ho had cited many economic gains that could be in the United States' favor, the Con sufficiently argued that human rights should be valued more. For these reasons, I vote Con.

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: 57 Narayanan - Mooney v. 19 Mick - Weiss


Novice Public Forum		Jon Cohen (*30)			
Round 2		Flight 1	Room 121	Fri 02/10/17 05:30PM	
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Mick	26	1st	Mooney	28
2nd	Weiss	26	2nd	Narayanan	25
The winner of this debate was Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)			_____ Judge's Signature Hamilton High / Engineer School / Affiliation / Occupation		
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.	

NPF

FLIP: 46 Durado - Perez v. 47 Chou - Zhang


Novice Public Forum		Jon Cohen (*30)			
Round 2	Flight 2	Room 121	Fri 02/10/17 05:30PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Zhang	25	1st	Durado	26
2nd	Chou	27	2nd	perez	25
The winner of this debate was (Pro) Con (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____			 Judge's Signature Hamilton High / Engineer School / Affiliation / Occupation		

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.	

^{2nd}
NPF

FLIP: 46 Yin - Mulkem v. 35 Pattichis - Struck

Novice Public Forum		Vincent Bai (*20)			
Round 2	Flight 1	Room 125	Fri 02/10/17 05:30PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	① Struck	27	1st	Mulkem (2)	25
2nd	③ Pattichis	25	2nd	Yin (4)	26
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
Pro Con (Circle Winner)			Scott Cole Prop. School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- well presented - good contentions clearly set forth. Nice delivery.
- Nice job - but delivery was a little too rapid and this detracted from effectiveness.
- On one hand, you state the embargo has been "completely ineffective," and on the other hand that Cuba is making improvements in joining the community of nations. - Do these go together?? Perhaps the embargo is causing the improvement...? Retort was superficial - you mainly re-stated what speaker ① said.
- Good rebuttal of "cruel punishment" contention. Partial rebuttal of other PRO points. Good that you pointed out this point.

Pro
 = cruel + universal punishment
 = contrary to US interests
 - economy
 - politically unpopular
 = eliminate Cuba's excuses for failures
 = we deal openly w/ equally bad countries w/o sanctions = hypocrisy

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.	

Con
 - Cuba isn't cooperating + shouldn't be "rewarded"
 - human rights
 - Not wise to help Cuba as it is
 - Cuba will benefit more than US
 - connection to Nikson?

Both teams did a good job + it was a good debate. Overall, PRO did a better job of presenting and defending

RFD: its case.

2 N/L
 40 W.
NPF
 FLIP: 9 Miller - Lafflam v. 40 Warrior - Exum

Novice Public Forum		Vincent Bai (*20)			
Round 2	Flight 2	Room 125	Fri 02/10/17 05:30PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Exum ①	26	1st	Lafflam ②	26
2nd	Warrior ③	27	2nd	Miller ④	26
The winner of this debate was		(53)	Judge's Signature		(52)
Pro Con (Circle Winner)			Scottsdale Prep School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- ① Well presented ... good points + good delivery
 - ② Also well done with good contentions
 - ③ Good rebuttal ... You made some contentions about what Raul Castro and Trump agreed on that seems questionable to me ... but CON did not challenge you, so it stands.
 - ④ Presentation was a little muddled but still good
- 2 - Summary - caught this


- PRO:**
- Raul is moving in the right direction so lift embargo - reward progress
 - stop harming Cuban citizens
 - medical supplies
 - food
 - will benefit US (economics)
- CON:**
- will only embolden Cuba - it won't
 - embargo goals have not been met yet
 - Trade profits will not flow to Cuban population

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.	

Good debate - a very close contest. On balance, RFD: PRO made a slightly better job of it.

NPF

FLIP: 1 Hladik - Kodyte v. 16 Bakshi - Cooley

Novice Public Forum		Hina Fazal (*38)			
Round 2		Flight 1		Room 527	Fri 02/10/17 05:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Bakshi	26	1st	Hladik	28
2nd	Cooley	28	2nd	Kodyte	27
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Chaparral Teacher School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>yes</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.	

B: - need to better organize questions & responses during cross → got confusing
 - could include more framework
 * do we have embargo against all oppressive gov's?

C: - strong pts in initial speech (timeframe for tourist #, drug access, def not pay debt w/ embargo)
 - strong on cross (thousands vs. millions/yr) (ineffective embargo)

* weakest pt → improve economy → need data on ? going to gov.
 * strongest pt → weaken regime → be ready for Europe comparison


H: - good speaking voice
 - easy to follow initial speech
 - should have brought in info about Soviet Union earlier → yet be ready to respond to contemporary issues

K: - strong pt → tourism from other democratic countries (could add internet access)
 - money = power → strong pt
 * both teams should know how other communists regime have fallen (SU) or not (China) & US relationship

* weakest pt - made Cuba more self-reliant (hard to argue - trade is bad)
 * strongest pt - supporting corrupt gov → wish more time was spent on it

NPF

FLIP: 20 Varghese - Moore v. 35 Sanyal - Karim

Novice Public Forum			Hina Fazal (*38)		
Round 2		Flight 2	Room 527		Fri 02/10/17 05:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Moore	29	1st	Karim	28
2nd	Varghese	28	2nd	Sanyal	27
The winner of this debate was <div style="display: flex; justify-content: center; align-items: center; gap: 20px;"> Pro Con </div> (Circle Winner)			 Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			Chaparral/Teacher School/Affiliation/Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

M: - don't need to define embargo
 - easy to follow initial speech
 - very strong on cross → great follow up questions →
 "Are you saying..." → very effective

V: - strong pts in initial speech but could have a better flow (option to access, minimal impact on drugs, tobacco already here)
 • could get a little confusing
 - cross → should have brought up FDA (Food & Drug Admin)
 • need to create clearer ?s

* strongest pt - access to medicine/food (U.S. image also flowed through)

K: - clear & well organized initial speech

- drugs coming through Cuba → be ready for ? to compare to all other Carib islands w/ no embargo
 • specific data on embargo enforcement?

S: - don't need to yell

- strong pt → leverage, but be ready for comparison response
 - cross - ?s could be clearer


make sure to listen to other team → got a couple of their pts wrong

* weakest pt - ~~harmful~~ ^{harmful} trade (illegal drugs, tobacco) → other islands? → be ready for FDA response
 * strongest pt - democracy/leverage

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: 1 Raola - Tandon v. 41 Martinez - Yu

Novice Public Forum			Clayton Guy (*58)		
Round 2		Flight 1	Room 525		Fri 02/10/17 05:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Tandon	27	1st	Martinez	27
2nd	Raola	27	2nd	Yu	28
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Arcadia School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Tandon - good clear, concise speech. Good research
 Raola good job going through each contention. Good team together. Raola good Final focus - clear & gave good 3 points - nice.


Martinez - good 3 contentions - voice was good
 Yu - good job on attacking contentions - good with reforms in Cuba now. Martinez Summary speech was very good - 3 key voters were clear & very good job
 Yu - very good debator, good final focus 3 max points & contentions flowed all to end.

Con overall won - Yu very good attacking contentions & Final focus strong. Martinez Summary strong. Pro did not convince me to left unchanged.

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 Schur - Reingold v. 9 Frindell - Reaves

Novice Public Forum			Clayton Guy (*58)		
Round 2		Flight 2	Room 525	Fri 02/10/17 05:30PM	
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Reingold	26	1st	Reaves	27
2nd	Schur	26	2nd	Frindell	28
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Arcadia HS School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con (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.	


Reingold - good, clear 15+ speech, only 3:38 -
 Could you add anything? Good facts & research
 Schur - good attack on other side. Both speakers
 lost place & had space - try to keep organized - your
 attacks were good - go quicker to help your side
 Reingold repeated 3 main points - used only 1:37 - use
 time

Reaves - clear points - 2 main points, might want
 3rd contention. Nice job Frindell - your speech was coherent
 & you did not attack other side - did not stop their flow
 you did reinforce your side. Reingold in summary repeated 3
 contentions - used good rebuttal in summary - need to mention your
 side. Know debate rules - support your case more. Great for both
 on country other side - carbon intake over US business & sugar
 example - good.

Con Wins - They kept to format, attacked Pro contentions
 & flowed better. Pro was consistent but did not attack
 Con contentions. Overall stronger debate

NPF

FLIP: 19 Epstein - Brown v. 35 Li - Sheng

Novice Public Forum		Benjamin Ladick (*47)	
Round 2	Flight 1	Room 123	Fri 02/10/17 05:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker Con Points (20-30)
1st	Brown.	24	1st Sheng. 26
2nd	Epstein	25	2nd Li 25
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature	
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)		Basis - Peoria School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? _____			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Speaker 1
 Diplomatically. economically.
 US still harsh with Cuba. Complicates
 6 billion goods to Cuba. Helping put sector
 elimination of embargo. Can do business
 with interference. Intl community
 support US is reasonable. no results.
 embargo hasn't worked.

Speaker 2 Embargo is not good.
 Trade with them talk to them. open the
 talk. Tobacco is legal.

Coast guard?
 benefits?

Speaker 1.
 Cuba is communist. 90%
 is going to govt. US
 chopped the embargo.
 Human Right - w/hty
 laws. force labor. strength
 detatship. Cuban cigar.
 25% of market b/c of cigar.
 drug smuggling. large exports
 of drugs. overheat the
 economy. embargo open
 door to capitalism.



Speaker 2 Li.
 Cuba is communist regime. 90% is going
 to state. abusive govt. trade between
 US and Cuba would go to state. it
 may look US weak. embargo has done
 so much. We should not promote toba
 what about drugs? Cocaine is coming to
 US through Cuba.

embargo money is going to govt
 Ben

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 Pandia - Ashworth v. 58 Massimi - Borchardt

Novice Public Forum			Dillan Butler (*13)		
Round 2		Flight 1	Room 528		Fri 02/10/17 05:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Pandia</u>	<u>27</u>	1st	<u>Borchardt</u>	<u>27</u>
2nd	<u>Ashworth</u>	<u>25</u>	2nd	<u>Massimi</u>	<u>25</u>
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature  School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The con side won the debate by showing that in the pro world, ~~removing~~ embargos would cause less of a benefit than a detriment while also showing that the pro side benefits were unsubstantiated.

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.	