

NPF

FLIP: 58 Campbell - Harris v. 16 Bakshi - Cooley

Novice Public Forum		Taylor Swanson (*35)	
Round 3	Flight 2	Room 524	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker
1st	Bakshi	22	1st
2nd	Cooley	23	2nd
			Con
			1st
			2nd
The winner of this debate was		Judge's Signature	
Pro Con		20 Foothills	
(Circle Winner)		School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win?			

Comments & Reason for Decision:


Hard to understand speech of Bakshi.
 Both girls didnt support their contentions w/ solid reasons + facts.
 Cooley didnt ask real question during quickfire. She gave a good summary - but again no facts to back it up -
 Didnt challenge their opponents contentions in speeches.

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

Both Campoell + Harris did a fine job setting up contention w/ fact, challenging the other team's contentions + lack of facts.

NPF

FLIP: 30 Matejsek - Stabilito v. 25 Sriram - Sriram

Novice Public Forum		Taylor Swanson (*35)			
Round 3	Flight 1	Room 524	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Stabilito	26	1st	A.N. Sriram	26
2nd	Matejsek	24	2nd	A.P. Sriram	26
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner)			20		
Is this a low point win? <u>yes</u>			School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:


Stabilito laid a strong ground work w/ solid contentions + backed it up w/ facts. Matejsek stumbled w/ her speech (I found it confusing) but she brought it home w/ a good summary + rebuttal of the other team's unsupported contentions. In the end, Matejsek convinced me!

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

~~Both Spirram s set up their~~
 Both Sriram s set up their contentions fine. But they could use more facts to support them.

NPF

FLIP: 16 Xin - Stevens v. 35 Sanyal - Karim

Novice Public Forum		Vincent Bai (*20)			
Round 3		Flight 1	Room 121		Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Stevens	26	1st	Karim	27
2nd	Xin	28	2nd	Sanyal	28
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Catalina Foothills School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>					



Comments & Reason for Decision:

I voted neg on the status quo already transitioning towards a more democratic state. While I didn't buy neg's framework of having to fulfill the Helms-Burton Act (as acts can be changed by Congress all the time), I do think their argument that ~~because~~ Cuba's government controls 90% of the Cuban economy reduces the impact of Alf's contentions. I viewed the "drugs" voter as a wash as there wasn't much clash and neither significantly outweighed the other.

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: 9 Frindell - Reaves v. 21 Sandoval - Preciado

Novice Public Forum		Carlos Nava (*53)			
Round 3	Flight 2	Room 526	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Sandoval	28	1st	Reaves	29
2nd	Preciado	27	2nd	Frindell	29
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature  School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con <input type="radio"/> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <input type="checkbox"/>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The Pro needed to be more prepared for the round. The Con had more convincing arguments.

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: 57 Narayanan - Mooney v. 20 Varghese - Moore

Novice Public Forum		Carlos Nava (*53)			
Round 3	Flight 1	Room 526	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Moore</u>	<u>29</u>	1st	<u>Mooney</u>	<u>29</u>
2nd	<u>Varghese</u>	<u>28</u>	2nd	<u>Narayanan</u>	<u>29</u>
The winner of this debate was Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)			<u>Carlos Nava</u> Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <input type="checkbox"/>			<u>Bonita Vista H.S.</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*The all presented their arguments clearly.
 The con presented more reasonable and convincing arguments*

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.	

LYON, JULIE (51)

NPF

FLIP: 43 Rahman - Velu v. 15 Hatch - Clarke

Novice Public Forum			Shannon Giovannoli (*51)		
Round 3		Flight 2	Room 521		Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Velu 4	25	1st	Hatch 1	27
2nd	Rahman 3	25	2nd	Clarke 2	27
The winner of this debate was			<p style="text-align: center;">Julie Lyon _____ Judge's Signature Basis Phoenix _____ School / Affiliation / Occupation</p>		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

30
40
20

2


Solid points from both sides
 con was more confident in
 presenting and during crossfires.

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.	

LYON, JULIE (S9)

NPF

FLIP: 35 Pattichis - Struck v. 36 Cole - Sainjusmat

Novice Public Forum			Shannon Giovannoli (*51)		
Round 3		Flight 1	Room 521		Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Struck 2	26	1st	Cole 4	25
2nd	Pattichis 1	27	2nd	Sainjusmat 3	25
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner)			Basis Phoenix School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Is this a low point win? _____					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro had more evidence for their points and made use of all time available. (But make sure to be there on time & silence your phone next time! :))


Con could have benefited from additional points & evidence.

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.	

GERDEMIS KOPIS (1)

NPF

FLIP: 38 Vasquez - Galan v. 46 Prouty - Heyman

Novice Public Forum			Jennifer Rhue (*5)		
Round 3		Flight 2	Room 124	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM	
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Manuel Vasquez	28	1st	Ronald Heyman	30
2nd	Adrian Galan	28	2nd	Aedan Prouty	30
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature BASIS AHNATODKIEK 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:

CON FRAMEWORK

1. HUMAN RIGHTS
USA LEVERAGE CARD
2. BENEFITS W/TA GOV
FOSTERING TERRORISM
IN LATIN AMERICA

SOUTH AFRICA
GOOD EXAMPLE!

GOOD REBUTAL!

GOOD SUMMARY!

WIN

CON

PRO

1. NOT NECESSARY
2. FAIL PURPOSE
3. TRADE WOULD BENEFIT
MOLLECHES CUBA
PEOPLE

CAPITAL WILL DRIVE
FREEDOM OF PEOPLE?

GOOD FOCUS!

FAIL TO SHOW BENEFITS
FOR CUBAN PEOPLE FROM
TRADE


REBUTED BY EXAMPLE OF
CHINA, RUSSIA AND...

PRO would benefit
if had a FRAMEWORK

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.	

GERDIEMS KODIS (1) NPF

FLIP: 20 Lenhart - Rascon v. 58 Massimi - Borchardt

Novice Public Forum			Jennifer Rhue (*5)		
Round 3		Flight 1	Room 124	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM	
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Allison Rascon	29	1st	Francesca Borchardt	29
2nd	Brooke Lenhart	28	2nd	Natalie Massimi	30
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature BASIS AHWATUO WARE 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:

CON

305.

1. HUMAN RIGHTS
2. STATE BENEFITS NOT PEOPLE
3. DEPT

~~all the reasons~~
 GOOD rebuttal!
 GOOD F. FOCUS!

WIN ON ALL CONTENTIONS

PRO

FRAMEWORK

1. BAIL PURPOSE
2. ECONOMY BENEFITS

LIFTING EMBARGO BENEFITS USA ONLY!
 NOT GET FROM CURA
 NO EVIDENCE FOR CURA PEOPLE BENEFIT

FAIL TO SHOW BENEFIT TO CURAN PEOPLE

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 IT WOULD BE BENEFICIAL TO HAVE A FRAMEWORK

NPF

FLIP: 5 Salamatn - Boyd v. 8 Tribby - Perez

Novice Public Forum		Vincent Bai (*20)			
Round 3	Flight 2	Room 121	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Salamatn	28	1st	Tribby	29
2nd	Boyd	27	2nd	Perez	27
The winner of this debate was			_____ Judge's Signature Catalina Fathills School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>Yes</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

In terms of framework, I viewed the round as a moral obligation, as both teams agreed. However, neg's observation of having access to any form of the embargo seemed a bit abusive to me, as it's essentially telling aff to defend against the perfect embargo. As such, I didn't give that framework much weight.

In terms of argumentation, I ended up voting for the aff because on a moral scale, they provide greater impact through the disproportionate impact on the Cuban people vs. the government and the increased availability of biotech. While neg did try to respond by saying the embargo created the biotech, I saw it as bc it was already created, & the embargo isn't necessary for it anymore. Smart sanctions I didn't buy for the reason above with the abusive framework.


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.	

FRANK, BRIEANA (21)

NPF

FLIP: 25 Pandia - Ashworth v. 1 Raola - Tandon

Novice Public Forum		Luke DiSimone (*46)			
Round 3	Flight 2	Room 123	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Tandon	25	1st	Pandia	25
2nd	Raola	27	2nd	Ashworth	28
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Mangala 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:

Very very close! But I was slightly more convinced by con's point that the government is to

Con - good questioning of pro's sources blame for much of the issues.

Pro - good back + forth during crossfire

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 not list

- has embargo achieved?
- #1 - ineffective
 - promote democracy?
 - advertising? cause of political system
 - limits access to medicine, tech.
 - use of death, suffering
 - goal to improve lives backfired
 - Cuba portrays self as victim
 - provide scapegoat,
 - #2 - benefits. no proof goal will change if embargo lifted
 - improve relations, less hostility
 - correlation between embargo/poverty rates
 - goal to improve lives


- definitions - good!
- Cuba has medical rationing
- wait necessary change
- #1 - Strengthen Cuban regime
 - benefits go to regime
 - Good citations!
 - damage intl integrity
 - US is leader, must be trustworthy
 - US exports to Cuba
 - has bad credit, in debt
 - goal to provide example
 - 2010 - Castro agrees to step down
 - Cuba legalizes private businesses

065 27 35

FRANK, BRIEANA (21)

NPF

FLIP: 25 Adelberg - Callahan v. 11 Hess-Neustadt - Mushro

Novice Public Forum		Luke DiSimone (*46)			
Round 3	Flight 1	Room 123	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Mushro	28	1st	Callahan	28
2nd	Hess-Neustadt	26	2nd	Adelberg	26
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)			Manuale HS School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Very very close! But I was slightly more convinced by Con's argument + they had stronger rebuttals

Adelberg - good voice + used facts, strong rebuttal
Hess-Neustadt - good rebuttals!

Callahan - good, thoughtful questions + responses

Mushro - good job at providing thoughtful responses, however you said "umm" a lot. (Dait way, it's hard for me too!)

Con

- shouldn't lift
- #1 - unconstitutional
- cruel dictatorship
- violating law of forced labor

US avoids while laws are changed often, could impress beliefs on anyone

US trades w/ other nations that violate

rebuttal? 1097 parties health science

Pro

- 1 - health effects
- impedes access to lifesaving drugs
- food scarce
- good citations!
- still Communist even though embargo has been lifted
- not-hand fallacy
- bad behavior increases chance of gang affiliate.
- causing credit crisis
- #3 - harms US economy
- #4 - illegal immigration + deaths from Cuba + US
- embargo from Cold War era
- Cuba has best healthcare
- Americans enslaved in Cubas
- conceded to other people's pain

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.	

- #2 - lead to more violations
- only 10% makes people
- ↳ guys who?
- #3 - public health issue
- alcohol, tobacco
- ↳ price down, consumption up
- Cuba args. Communist regime harbor US rebels
- (factcheck.org) is no evidence to show attack on
- US, US supports military regimes too.

NPF

FLIP: 9 Miller - Lafflam v. 47 Chou - Zhang

Novice Public Forum		Vance Robbins (*40)			
Round 3	Flight 2	Room 125	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Zhang	22	1st	Lafflam	26
2nd	Chou	24	2nd	Miller	23
The winner of this debate was			Vance Robbins		
Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con			Judge's Signature		
(Circle Winner)			P.U.S./P/Facilities		
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:



- ① Zhang: Good speech volume and speed. Covered many points.
- ② Lafflam: Points supported and delivered with excellent speech.
XFire: Good XFire on both sides.
- ③ Chou: Good speech comparing Cuba to other countries situations
- ④ Miller: covered previous points well
XFire: Equal match on this XFire.
- ① Summary: Zhang: Good research points supported.
- ② Summary: Lafflam: fired back with calling into question several Pro's points.
- Grand XFire: Good, both sides.
- ③ Final Chou: stayed on point and supported contentions.
- ④ Final Miller: strong rebuttal of Pro's ideas.

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.	

ONNEWEE, NIZENKA (41)

NPF

FLIP: 35 Gadiyar - Shih v. 19 Mick - Weiss

Novice Public Forum			Sidharth Kulkarni (*43)		
Round 3		Flight 2	Room 522	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM	
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	S	25	1st	M	26
2nd	G	26	2nd	W	25
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? _____		

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.	

SG = Some of your language is juvenile in the grand scheme of things. I don't see how espionage & oil spill is so important. However, it was nice to hear. Just would like to see it argued better.

Both: Do not interrupt each other. I don't tolerate both of your rude attitudes.

RFD: ~~Pro's rebuttal was more effective~~
 Con's content was never tested, & Pro's oil spill did not make much sense

RFD: ~~Con's content was never tested, & Pro worked up a lot of imaginary scenarios & theories.~~

Novice Public Forum			Sidharth Kulkarni (*43)		
Round 3		Flight 1	Room 522		Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	D	24	1st	L	25
2nd	B	22 21	2nd	F	26
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Mesquite 41 School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(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.	



- DB - Real Cuatro... is not dead.
- Please practice speaking 1 can barely follow
 - You're so nervous.
 - Please have your cards in order.

- LF - ENUNCIATE. Could not hear your 2nd contention.
- You play w/ your hand.
 - Sometimes your language is juvenile. It doesn't help.

RFD: Con had better rebuttals + contentions, but overall both lost sources + need to rethink their cases.

NPF

FLIP: 1 Hladik - Kodyte v. 38 Danciu - Hunt

Novice Public Forum		Syed Huq (*47)			
Round 3	Flight 2	Room 527	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Hladik	26	1st	Danciu	29
2nd	Kodyte	29	2nd	Hunt	26
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? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					

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.	

Frame:


- Pro's: Con argued that 5x increase in Cuban private sector was a success. Normally I wouldn't accept this because they didn't prove the embargo as the cause, but Pro did not manage to attack it, so I must flow it through.
- Con's: Federal law can be overruled by other federal law, but Pro chose not to use that avenue of attack and did not manage to push through Con's frame.

- Con's point that extra \$ in trade would fund the oppressive regime was never well refuted by Pro (you almost kind of conceded to it)

- Both of you ^{teams} kind of fizzled out on financial arguments at the end so I did not weigh them

NPF

FLIP: 9 Carney - Olson v. 19 Epstein - Brown

Novice Public Forum		Syed Huq (*47)	
Round 3	Flight 1	Room 527	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker
1st	Brown	24 28	1st
2nd	Epstein	26 28	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con		 Judge's Signature	
(Circle Winner)		Perry HS	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Regarding citizens:

Both teams seemed almost to be talking past each other; i.e. both claim to value the citizens and present evidence but do not attack the other's


And remember: PF is factual!
Baseless rhetoric is useless to me

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: 41 Martinez - Yu v. 35 Li - Wang

Novice Public Forum		Anna Skinner (#38) - Dillan Butler (#13)			
Round 3	Flight 2	Room 525	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Martinez	28	1st	Wang	20/26
2nd	Yu	27	2nd	Li	26
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature McClintock School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>					


Comments & Reason for Decision:

The pro side won this debate by providing a better case for economy and lives lost. The con side failed to show benefits of the embargo when it came to these issues. The pro side also showed that the embargo is currently ineffective while the con side failed to show how this would change in the status quo.

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: 35 Choi - Sung v. 57 Lyon - Ravi

Novice Public Forum		Anna Skinner (#38) Dillian Butler (#13)			
Round 3	Flight 1	Room 525	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Choi	27	1st	Lyon	26
2nd	Sung	27	2nd	Ravi	26
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature McClinstock School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Pro Con Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The pro side was by showing that the pro side provided more impacts through the voting issues of biotech and economy. The voting issue at denouncing was a wash but the pro side won on a not economic benefit and the health benefit of kuba biotech to the US.

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: 40 Warrior - Exum v. 46 Yin - Mulkern

Novice Public Forum			Eugene Chung (*30)		
Round 3		Flight 2	Room 523	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM	
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Exum</u>	<u>29</u>	1st	<u>Mulkern</u>	<u>27.5</u>
2nd	<u>Warrior</u>	<u>28</u>	2nd	<u>Yin</u>	<u>29</u>
The winner of this debate was					
<p style="text-align: center;"> Pro Con (Circle Winner) </p>			<p style="text-align: center;"> <u>Eugene Chung</u> Judge's Signature </p>		
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>			<p style="text-align: center;"> <u>Scottsdale Prep</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation </p>		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Exum

- outstanding opening 4 minutes, discussing both noneconomic and economic benefits of lifting the embargo.
- excellent speaker style. direct and easy to understand.

Mulkern

- excellent, nuanced 4 minute opening → lifting embargo will benefit an oppressive government more than their people, and does not guarantee a more open economy.
- Speaker Summary made new claim regarding Cuban dealing in intelligence/spying. Proof?

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.	

Warrior

- excellent speaker style. engages audience and speaks in a logical, easy to understand manner. Final Focus very strong.
- effective discussion regarding nonmonetary benefits to Cuban people if embargo is lifted (health care, food, etc.)
- Best moment during Crossfire: should we apply same standards to China, versus Cuba?
- USA has not formally established diplomatic relations with North Korea.

Yin

- effective discussion regarding how the Cuban government has failed to meet conditions for lifting the embargo.
- Grand Crossfire was best moment. Excellent example of Cuban weapons being found on a NK ship, as a reason why Cuban government cannot be trusted.
- outstanding Final Focus. concise and clear.

RFD: Pro side discussed economic and noneconomic issues equally well. Very close debate as Speaker Yin was effective with counter arguments.

NPF

FLIP: 20 Storie - Peper v. 46 Durado - Perez

Novice Public Forum		Eugene Chung (*30)			
Round 3	Flight 1	Room 523	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Chris Dorado</u>	<u>28</u>	1st	<u>Jason Peper</u>	<u>28.5</u>
2nd	<u>David Perez</u>	<u>29</u>	2nd	<u>Clay Storie</u>	<u>28</u>
The winner of this debate was			<u>Eugene Chung</u> Judge's Signature <u>Scottsdale Prep</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Dorado

- strong presentation regarding economic benefits of lifting embargo.
- best moment during Grand Crossfire, citing ↑ economic benefits likely to ↓ economic incentives to turn to prostitution.

Peper

- effective discussion of environmental and women's rights issues, but little discussion regarding economic issues during initial 4 minutes.
- Speaker Summary discussion on economic issues was very effective
- even-keel, quick thinker ⇒ great potential

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.	

Perez

- strongest argument: how does keeping the embargo improve the human rights situation?
- effective speaking style, easy to understand, logical, and makes good eye contact.

Storie

- direct and strong speaking style.
- effective discussion regarding human rights having an intangible value, versus economic benefits.
- can cite additional literature to support arguments.
- best moment: Final Focus crystallized argument that lifting the embargo will eventually lead to ↓ agricultural output.

RFD: Pro side cited numerous arguments for lifting ban. Close debate as Speaker Storie convincingly discussed human rights issues.

NPF

FLIP: 25 Schur - Reingold v. 15 Beltran - Castaneda

Novice Public Forum		Vance Robbins (*40)			
Round 3	Flight 1	Room 125	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Reingold	25 26	1st	Castaneda	23
2nd	Schur	22	2nd	Beltran	21
The winner of this debate was			Vance Robbins		
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner)			Judge's Signature PHS / Facilities		
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

① Reingold: lots of good facts
 XFire: pro did good job of pressing for historic/political facts, clarifications.

③ Schur: kept on point with previous facts.

④ Beltran: good support of partner's speech, concentrate on strong facts rather than rhetorical questions
 XFire: allow both sides to ask questions and not so much supporting of mentioned facts.

① Reingold: kept on point of how history sees embargo.

② Castaneda: led off with economic impacts.

Grand XFire: Good back-forth try to keep to more questioning

③ Schur, Final: Brought up points not attacked by con.


④ Beltran, Final: good speech. try to keep notes arranged or numbered to access quickly.

Pro kept contentions valid.

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 Callies - Diaz v. 35 Li - Sheng

Novice Public Forum			Kristin Andreatos (*9)		
Round 3		Flight 1	Room 528	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM	
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Diaz	30	1st	Sheng	28
2nd	Callies	30	2nd	Li	28
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature BASIS Flagstaff School / Affiliation / Occupation		
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? _____					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Resolve - The US should lift its embargo against Cuba
 Callies - 2nd Pro
 Diaz - 1st

- that Callies flow & presentation was smooth
- nice defense of team
- clear attacking cons

Con
 Sheng - 1st
 Li - 2nd
 • stated having a war with Cuba clearly looked like a concession to etc

• that Sheng's cons clear & easy to follow

• could see your impact nice use of pathos

Of the 3 main, former times I believe pro proved their case for 2/3 contributions.

Framework was easy to follow; not sure you disproved Con but supported yours.

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.	