

embargo is only way to change Cuba.


FAZAL, HINA

Bobcat Bonanza 2017

promotes capitalism in world market.

VPF

FLIP: 16 Aberg - Braun v. 49 Jasso - Kief

Varsity Public Forum			Hina Fazal (*38)		
Round 1			Room 422		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Kief	25	1st	Braun	24
2nd	Jasso	27	2nd	Aberg	25
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
(Circle Winner) Pro Con Is this a low point win? YES NO					
School / Affiliation / Occupation					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro

1st liberalization for cuba.
 1939-1993 drop. political sys.
 Faust attraction. Human right violation.
 Communist govt.

1st con.

embargo

Corrupt sys. worker exploited.
 not allowed. wrote off debts.
 U.S should not give away this leverage politically
 or economically. govt get 90% of wages. all
 taken by govt.
 75.5 million spent on healthcare.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

Speaker 1	4 min	done
Speaker 2	4 min	done
Crossfire (1 & 2) *	3 min	done
Speaker 3	4 min	done
Speaker 4	4 min	
Crossfire (3 & 4) *	3 min	done
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 pro


Time to change Cuba - economic benefits to US travel ban
 benefitting ourselves. govt controls the economy. HRights open
 political dialogue with Cuba - Changes in Cuba. China & Vietnam
 trade. prevents us from diplomatic

2nd con.

impact ppt public health. we are not sure market is there.
 PPIs are suffering in Cuba. When sensation lifted no response
 from Cuba. China has communist
 Benefits to US. no investment in Cuba. 5% GDP

VPF

FLIP: 51 Yague - Dunlop v. 20 Ackerley - Chen

Varsity Public Forum		Mary-Jo Okawa (*37)			
Round 1		Room 868	Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Yague	22	1st	Chen	27
2nd	Dunlop	22	2nd	Ackerley	26
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature BASIS Scottsdale/Teacher 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's point on cheap healthcare as a pro was unsupported. Whereas con's point that affordable healthcare could be obtained throughout the world held more weight.
- Con's argument that economic stability and growth would not promote democracy was stronger than Pro's assertion to the contrary.
- Although pro's argument ^{was strong} that our embargo violates International Law and that we should ~~support~~ ^{emphasize} the U.N.'s advice and heed their condemnations, Con made a stronger point that we would be doing more harm than good seemed to be supported by their points that we are closer to aiding democracy in Cuba with sanctions in place.
- Source citing on both sides could have been stronger.
- Con's responses to questions ^{were} ~~provided~~ more complete and comprehensible ~~was~~.

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.	

VPF

FLIP: 40 Tomooka - Thomas v. 5 Cardone - Rusk

Varsity Public Forum		Aamirah Chisti (*43)			
Round 1		Room 880		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Cardone	29 28	1st	Thomas	29 28
2nd	Rusk	30 29	2nd	Tomooka	28 30
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature BASIS Chandler School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</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.	

Pro

- Case was a little repetitive, could use more statistics
- Check health care facts.
- origins of embargo.
- should talk more about how fixing embargo directly would help with that.
- good on ~~all~~ healthcare colab.
- ~~did not~~ reputation was not ~~strong~~ strong enough

Con


- you argue that it is in the power of Cuba to change which is good, but you need to specify how.
- good on minimal effects of fixing embargo.
- counterplan/strengthening unnecessary.
- > failed to refute
- good on sending medical assistance & food.
- great rebuttal & FF.

Pro | Con
 1:15 | :30
 :15

- remember to make your claim, warrant, and impacts very clear.
- very impressive rebuttals & CF on both sides.
- both cases could be a lot better written. they weren't that great tbh.
- Arguing for the strengthening of embargo is unrelated/counterplan and unnecessary to ~~the~~ argument.

VPF

FLIP: 57 Gaidici - Kirkpatrick v. 35 Kandan - Gupta

Varsity Public Forum			Jennifer Rhue (*5)		
Round 1			Room 876		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Gaidici	25	1st	Gupta	24
2nd	Kirkpatrick	27	2nd	Kandan	26
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature MHS School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(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.	

(51 sec)
1:09
2 min used

Gaidici (4:00)
Gaidici (2:02)

good speaking voice
clear & concise
fantastic use of time
never give up 1st?
you seemed a little off in CX

Discouraging
dominant
structure

(55 min)
1:05
2 min used

Gupta (4:03)
Gupta (2:06)

confident speaker
clear & concise speaker
very polite
watch "ummm"

① democratization
② economic impacts

Kirkpatrick (4:02)
Kirkpatrick (2:03)

try not to fidget as you speak


good, confident speaker
good use of evidence as you speak
as the speech went on, you seemed less sure of yourself
fantastic terminology (static & dynamic)
good job controlling CX

Kandan (4:05)
Kandan (2:07)

you are intense when you speak - I like it.
stumbled over words a bit
confident speaker - clear & concise
2008 evidence - a bit dated
find a way to have info at eye level so you're not hunched over
need evidence - not assumptions
when you ask a question, pause for the answer & don't interrupt

VPF

FLIP: 57 Henden - Gordon v. 58 Wieck - Razor

Varsity Public Forum			Xavier Henes (*28)		
Round 1			Room 882		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Gordon	27	1st	Wieck	26
2nd	Henden	28	2nd	Razor	23
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Horizon 28 School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? <u>yes</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:


On the negative you both seem extremely passive and uneasy. The reading of case is fine. On the rebuttal use cards to hit their case. Fluency is lacking in the rebuttal. Tell me why anything you say is important in your rebuttal you just stating things but giving me no follow through. What you need to do in the rebuttal is sign post through their case and go point by point like I said cross-x is for you to learn things about your opponents.

For the affirmative, you need to work on why you're right. You don't link your arguments back to the resolution the wording requires not just facts but a "why" which neither you nor the negation seem to take hold of. You talk about the aide and not the scope or plausibility. You give me fewer reasons as to why transfer of knowledge or any monetary

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.	

VPF

FLIP: 41 Joseph - Delgado v. 55 Takhar - Tam

Varsity Public Forum		Shannon Giovannoli (*51)			
Round 1		Room 881	Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Takhar Takhar	26	1st	Delgado	27
2nd	Tam	28	2nd	Joseph	25
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Pennacle / teacher School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>					


Comments & Reason for Decision:

great job! This is a difficult 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.	

1:15
20

53.



Keep papers organized to help quickly access contentions (this did not factor into judging) sticky notes are great!

allow each other speak during CF! try not to interrupt.

Don't introduce new topics in CF. the human rights piece should be brought up in arguments, then clarified in CF.

*super distracting when ~~you~~ you are whispering to one another while opponent is speaking. you want to ensure your judge can flow entire argument -



VPF

FLIP: 37 Vijayakumar - Samant v. 35 Wang - Ramesh

Varsity Public Forum		Carl Liaupsin (*20)			
Round 1		Room 403	Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM		
Speaker	Pro ^{Good 1st} ⁺⁺	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con ⁺⁺	Points (20-30)
1st	Vijayakumar	28	1st	WANG	28
2nd	SAMANT ⁺⁺ Good	25	2nd	RAMESH ⁺⁺	28
The winner of this debate was			Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)		
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			Carl Liaupsin Judge's Signature CAT FEATHILLS / School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Time frame - Toss up - Neither side made a strong cohesive argument. Except at Final Focus by Con

Pro CARDS - Were not readily available for review.

% increases & decreases - Pretty weak on both sides except for 95% of economy controlled by government pro Also 2 billion in investments by Pro

Pro missed negation of reduced size of military

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.	

PREP
50 sec
↓
20 sec

PREP
used

VPF

FLIP: 20 Labenz - Wallace v. 13 Flores - Knorr

Varsity Public Forum		Eugene Chung (*30)			
Round 1		Room 823	Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Jason Knorr	28	1st	Samantha Wallace	27
2nd	Matthew Flores	29	2nd	Alexander Labenz	27
The winner of this debate was			<u>Eugene Chung</u> Judge's Signature <u>Scottsdale Prep</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:

Knorr

- clear, concise discussion of economic and health care benefits.
- dominant performance during first crossfire. questioned the logic behind the idea that human rights will be better under the status quo.

Wallace

- excellent discussion of risks of lifting embargo. discussion of debt default, property rights / taxes issues was particularly effective.
- occasionally started an argument, then stopped and changed course.

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.	

Flores

- convincing argument for economic liberalization → funding/capital will flow to individuals, not government.
- effective argument regarding continuing human rights violations despite embargo.
- dynamic, articulate, confident speaker. excellent engagement and eye contact.
- Final Focus was particularly strong.

Labenz

- argued that sanctions do not work, which supports the affirmative argument.
- Final Focus was best moment. Arguments were well articulated and easy to understand. This would have been even more effective if used during the initial 4 minute speech.

RFD: Pro effectively pointed out inconsistencies in opponent's arguments. Con did not argue convincingly re: economic benefits of lifting the embargo.

VPF

FLIP: 20 Wicklund - Gaudet v. 13 Chen - Reddie


Varsity Public Forum		Sabrina Porter (*55)			
Round 1		Room 860	Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Gaudet	24	1st	Reddie	28
2nd	Wicklund	24	2nd	Chen	26
The winner of this debate was			Sabrina Porter		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)			Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			55 (PLDS) Business Owner School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The con side did a better job with laying out their framework as well as values used for their argument. Also, con did a better job of attacking case of Pro. Pro was more on defense & didn't have much by way of critique for con. Excellent job everyone. You are all very bright & articulate!

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 2 VPF 1st Pro
 FLIP: 53 Ly - Armenta v. 20 Capin - Stebner

Varsity Public Forum		Yishi Garrard (*1)			
Round 1		Room 862	Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Capin	28	1st	Ly	26
2nd	Stebner	29	2nd	Armenta	22
The winner of this debate was <input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			 Judge's Signature <u>1/ Volunteer / Program Manager</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		


Comments & Reason for Decision:

Oral feedback 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.	

VPF

FLIP: 9 Nguyen - Schulman v. 16 DeLashmutt - Bencomo

Varsity Public Forum		Peter Kolshorn (*53)			
Round 1		Room 869	Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>1 Bencomo</u>	<u>27</u>	1st	<u>2 Nguyen</u>	<u>29</u>
2nd	<u>3 DeLashmutt</u>	<u>28</u>	2nd	<u>4 Schulman</u>	<u>28</u>
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)			<u>Bonita Vista</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Reason for Decision: I decided for the Con. Pro was prepared + made many excellent points. I felt that Net made strong arguments vs. Lat Am influence + Chinese influence while also bringing up strong points on the economy. ~~Net~~ PRO wasn't able to really rise above the results. Con did a strong job on economy.

Individual speaking feedback will give verbally.

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 **VPF** Pro

FLIP: 16 Raju - Goswick v. 34 Cheng - Moriarty

Varsity Public Forum		Vance Robbins (*40)			
Round 1		Room 836	Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Cheng	23	1st	Goswick	27
2nd	Moriarty	25	2nd	Raju	28
The winner of this debate was			Vance Robbins		
Pro Con			Judge's Signature		
(Circle Winner)			P.V. HS / P / Facilities		
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Pro. Con.
- ① Cheng: Good references from the start speech started on points
 - X Fire: Con takes this Xfire, carrying points about wages and Human Rights
 - ② Goswick: Good Human Rights points. Carried throughout speech.
 - ③ Moriarty: Some good points about increase of wages and net access.
 - ④ Raju: Carried Con points from Goswick. Dented Pro's ideas with rebuttals.
 - X Fire: Con takes Xfire. Points held up against Pro's points. more solid references.

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

① Summary: Good comeback with facts support

② Summary: Strong rebuttals.

Grand Xfire: Con led Xfire with focus on the internet issue,


③ Final: carried points about wage increases and increasing tech access.

④ Final: Demonstrated flaws in Pro's information support.

All: good speech cadence and volume, excellent Round. Made it a tough choice

VPF

FLIP: 37 Sidapara - Niu v. 32 Carr - Hughes

Varsity Public Forum		KDee Heath (*16)			
Round 1		Room 866	Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Niu	28	1st	Hughes	27
2nd	Sidapara	27	2nd	Carr	25
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature 16 School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Pro Con Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro

Niu - good speed, good volume, confident, a few stumbles

Sidapara - a little too aggressive (it was overwhelming), good volume, very confident

Con

Hughes - good volume/emotion, a little too slow (I felt like you could have sped up a little and covered more)

Carr - very slow, you spent a lot of time (especially in your 1st speech) making the PRO's arguments for them


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 did a better job of showing real impacts and linking their arguments directly to the US. Con, your first two points (coral reefs and farming) did not show me exactly how the US would affect the environment. Con also relied a lot on theoreticals (especially in the Final focus). Both teams seemed very condescending, especially in cross x. You don't have to agree with your opponent's arguments but please at least show each other some respect.

VPF

FLIP: 46 Schaefer - Elsbecker v. 43 Wang - Samin

Varsity Public Forum		Scott Sammons (*3)			
Round 1		Room 827	Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Elsbecker	27	1st	Wang	26
2nd	Schaefer	29	2nd	Samin	25
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Tolleson Union School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision: (general notes on back)


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:
- Stronger support of empirical evidence than con.
 - Very effective responses to crossfire questions
 - Good choices of sources especially on point related to the medical contention.
 - Strong response stating free trade trickles down to people eventually (NYT)
 - Some ineffective questions in crossfires (ex: proximity)
 - Too many clarifying questions in crossfires (yes answers) and didn't effectively integrate responses

- Con:
- Aside from Huff Po quote on U.S.-Cuban medical interaction already, not nearly enough done to refute Pro's medical contention.
 - Multi-faceted argument which is good
 - Good examples of human rights violations especially following Bush/Obama travel changes.
 - While the proximity of Cuba to Florida legitimized environmental concern, more specific evidence was needed
 - Speaker 2 had a quieter voice than a debate tone
 - Both speakers had some hesitation on questions

VPF

FLIP: 30 Zhou - Chung v. 38 Potter - Yakoob

Varsity Public Forum		Scott Schuerman (*50)			
Round 1	120 74 450	Room 832	20 100 300		
Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM					
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
② 1st j	chung	29	① 1st iii	POTTER	27
④ 2nd ii	Zhou	28	③ 2nd iii	Yakoob	27
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature GCA / systems Analyst School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con <input type="radio"/> Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>					


Comments & Reason for Decision:

- PRO** SP1 - POTTER - A lot of good data and good use of sources. Talking speed was too fast. Suggest that you use less data and talk more slowly.
- PRO** SP2 - CHUNG - well defined framework - clear and easy to understand.
- PRO** CROSS 1/2 - Great humor and faith questioning and responding by both PRO and CON. Excellent cross!
- PRO** SP3 - YAKOOB - Excellent rebuttal to PRO's framework, good point-by-point challenges to PRO.
- PRO** SP4 - ZHOU - Good use of relevant examples of how embargoes have failed in the past. Very comprehensive. Excellent.
- EVEN** CROSS 3/4 - PRO and CON both participated fully and provided excellent questioning and responses.
- PRO** SP1 SUMMARY POTTER - Fairly weak arguments - Environment and exploitation.
- PRO** SP2 SUMMARY - CHUNG - Presented a wide-range of arguments to bolster the PRO case and challenge CON.
- CON** GRAND CROSS - CON was superior and controlled the debate.
- CON** SP3 FF - YAKOOB - Good comprehensive wrap-up from CON.
- CON** SP4 FF - ZHOU - Good identification of holes in CON's case.

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 provided more convincing arguments. CON seemed to dwell on biodiversity harms and exploitation. CON needed more convincing evidence to rebutt PRO. PRO's speakers were both superior to CON. POTTER machine-gunned her opening statements. Slow down a little and present fewer arguments.

pro
2nd
R
L
con
F
V
V
VPF
FLIP: 20 Liaupsin - Little v. 40 Ball - Rolfness

Varsity Public Forum		Danny Deniger (*19)			
Round 1		Room 833	Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Liaupsin	29	1st	Rolfness	25
2nd	Little	28	2nd	Ball	27
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Shadow Mtn School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</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.	

pro
1st - Please provide year & author when you read evidence
2nd - make sure you give roadmap
1st - choppy summary
* Your voter was that you "promote democracy" but the evidence you gave showed "opponent does not support democracy". Not the same.


con
1st - No definition of utilitarianism? what's the point of framework if you don't define?
- say explicit contention numbers in your constructive please (missing for CS)
2nd - Big lack of warrants in my opinion
1st - ROADMAP! AAAAH!

* You needed a better response to "60 years" argument
- interesting clash... good first debate on this topic
- it's grand cross... make sure both speakers are involved.
- I think both teams needed to do a better job of distinguishing between harms of Embargo and harms of communism.

RFP: I voted ^{Pro} ~~Con~~ for the greater diversity of evidence and succinct summary of impacts.

VPF

FLIP: 13 Venkatachalam - Showers v. 30 Cohen - Cohen

Varsity Public Forum		Ryan Robinson (*32)			
Round 1		Room 863	Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Jordan Cohen	28	1st	Kate Lynn Showers	26
2nd	Shayna Cohen	29	2nd	Harshini Venkatachalam	29
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
(Pro) Con (Circle Winner)			Suburo HS / Teacher School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Is this a low point win? No.					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Good analysis on the framework argument in Lx & in speaker 3.

Speaker 4 you do use analysis & explain your cards.

Con. use your crossfire more effectively. Press your points on state corruption etc...

S' Summary. Speak more clearly if your saying that first.

Con. I like your card. More analysis on state corruption & carbon of funds was needed.

Pro. Why not argue more that there exist human rights, & you win under the framework. Freedom as a human right.

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. I vote Pro in this Round due to a more sustained analysis on the impacts of Agriculture & medicine. They also win the debate that the embargo is the source of the problem. The Russia's crime was less analyzed & not my vote.

VPF

FLIP: 55 Tehranchi - Afework v. 35 Bawa - Kapadya

Varsity Public Forum		Sherry Meng (*17)			
Round 1		Room 875	Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Tehranchi</u>	<u>27</u>	1st	<u>Kapadya</u>	<u>29</u>
2nd	<u>Afework</u>	<u>28</u>	2nd	<u>Bawa</u>	<u>28</u>
The winner of this debate was Pro <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner)			<u>Sherry Meng</u> Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>			<u>Corona del sol parent</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		


Comments & Reason for Decision:

The key voter comes down to whether the benefit of embargo outweighs the harms it brings. Con addressed the issue with more evidences.

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.	

VPF

FLIP: 46 Ramos - Gopal v. 16 Wakefield - Gustin



Varsity Public Forum		Shoba Ramesh (*35)	
Round 1		Room 402	Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker
1st	<u>Eden Gustin</u>	<u>25</u>	1st
2nd	<u>Jackson Wakefield</u>	<u>25</u>	2nd
	Con	Points (20-30)	
			1st
			2nd
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? <u>No</u>		<u>Hamilton High / Engineer</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.	

VPF

FLIP: 47 Bauman - Deaver v. 53 Neuner - Rivera

Varsity Public Forum			Howard Peterson (*25)		
Round 1			Room 878		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Bauman	24 25	1st	Rivera	25 25
2nd	Deaver	24 26	2nd	Neuner	26 26
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:

Con
 who max's qual of life
 HR violate
 - free of Express via media
 - corrupt legal Sys
 - needed to allow.
 - inter nat law Prohib on
 forced labor.
 moral ob. to maintain
 Counter Product -
 will not immed to express
 remove the Castro
 Benefit from Human SUFF (Palmas)

3:48

Pro
 Based on
 impacts of
 arg.
 - Stop Com.
 UNJUSTIFIED
 91 USSR Disolve
 not a threat
 (B) failed to
 achieve goals
 impact
 travel 1.8 would go 1.6 Bill
 Harvard loses Jobs.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1.....	4 min - 3:48
Speaker 2.....	4 min - 3:34
Crossfire (1 & 2) *.....	3 min - ✓
Speaker 3.....	4 min - 4:07
Speaker 4.....	4 min - 4:09
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.	


not Frame work not just impacts
 Human qual of life.
 Human Rights
 US Econ. (moral arguement) 2010
 Victims - cherry Picked - # were
 not Present. 4:07
 Trade w/all others no help to us.

(2) Victims
 Deaths
 Cuban Heave Prob.
 - nutrition
 - Procure of drugs
 - 889 of 3K Drugs
 express.

Econ will increase qual of
 life
 nothing to stop the violations
 to supply qual of life
 (internet) natural reform.

VPF

FLIP: 35 Sun - Zhang v. 50 Alam - Corrigan

Varsity Public Forum		Kim Kunasek (*9)			
Round 1		Room 825	Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	SUN SUN	25	1st	ALAM ALAM	24
2nd	ZHANG ZHANG	26	2nd	CORRIGAN CORRIGAN	
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature ACP-ERIC/JUDGE School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

BETTER REBUTALS & CROSS; MORE PERSUASIVE REASONING & BETTER DELIVERY

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.	

ALAM - EVIDENCE GOOD
 DELIVERY UNEVEN - FALTERED AT TIMES; PACE FAST
 REASONING SOLID
 CROSS OK; GOT WORSE IN GRAND
 REBUTAL OK; GOT WORSE IN GRAND

SUN - EVIDENCE OK; GOT BETTER BUT NOT ALWAYS LIKED REASONING
 DELIVERY MONOTONE, LOUD & FAST; SOME FALTERING
 REASONING UNEVEN
 REBUTAL OK; GOT STRONGER IN GRAND
 CROSS EFFECTIVE

CORRIGAN - DELIVERY UNEVEN; GOT A LITTLE LOST; REPEATED PHRASES ("MOVING ON")
 EVIDENCE OK; ~~FLAWED~~
 REASONING NOT ALWAYS SOLID/TIED TO EVIDENCE; FLAWED IN SPOTS
 REBUTAL CHALLENGED & NOT ALWAYS ~~EFFECTIVE~~
 CROSS FALTERED EFFECTIVE

ZHANG - DELIVERY MONOTONE, LOUD & TOO FAST - ~~SOME~~ SOME WORDS UNINTELLIGIBLE
 EVIDENCE GOOD
 REASONING OK
 REBUTAL STRONG
 CROSS STRONG - very good

VPF

FLIP: 35 Jung - Long v. 3 Strauch - Sanchez-Lonnie

Varsity Public Forum		Benjamin Ladick (*47)	
Round 1		Room 865	Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker
1st	<u>Sanchez-Lonnie</u>	<u>27</u>	1st <u>Mindy Long</u>
2nd	<u>Daniel Strauch</u>	<u>28</u>	2nd <u>Chaelin Jung</u>
The winner of this debate was			
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <u>HW</u> (Circle Winner)		<u>Madhavi Weidelt</u> Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>		<u>Brophy</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:


- A -
 - UN against embargo - violates human rights
 - Obama allows travel
 - U.S.A violates human rights of Cubans
 - trade will benefit U.S.
 - China doesn't pose a serious threat
 - ruling lineage coming to end
 - Raul open to U.S. negotiations
 - human Rights already violated
- C -
 - keep regime under control
 - stop spread of communism / socialism
 - prevent Chinese intervention
 - damage Cuban economy
 - ~~dictators~~ dictators control economy
 - 80% of economy → military control
 - UN not willing to take action
 - Raul approved future oligarchy

- Better foreign relations
- Cubans defecting
- embargo outdated

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.	

VPF

FLIP: 17 Jiang - Frazey v. 16 Fiber - Lane

Varsity Public Forum		Josh Beram (*46)			
Round 1		Room 870	Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Frazey	28	1st	Lane	27
2nd	Jiang	29	2nd	Fiber	29
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Brophy 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:

Cross fire was overall better for Frazey? Jiang. Defended questions well, made points that couldn't be defended well / put opponents in a tough position.

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.	

VPF

FLIP: 38 Parau - Kim v. 46 Vaughn - Gonzales

Varsity Public Forum		Dillan Butler (*13)			
Round 1		Room 839	Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Gonzales	27	1st	Kim	29
2nd	Vaughn	28	2nd	Parau	30
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature McClintock School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>30</u>					


Comments & Reason for Decision:

The con side won the debate by showing that keeping the embargo would lead Cuba to a democracy and increase ^{social} ~~social~~ ^{economic} impacts whereas removing the embargo would remove the US's power over Cuba and ability to influence them.

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.	

VPF

FLIP: 46 Cardellini - Coben v. 30 Khan - Patel

Varsity Public Forum		Clayton Guy (*58)			
Round 1		Room 837	Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Coben	28	1st	Khan	27
2nd	Cardellini	28	2nd	Patel	26
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Arcadia HS School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con 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.	

Coben - good/solid contentions, US policy & US is main point - opportunity lost strong point. Cardellini strong rebuttal, good mix of interest, Coben very strong Summary - clear, concise, made sense. Good direction of flow - good team together strong

Khan - Be clearer on contention 1 - good statistics & #'s in 1st speech. Patel - strong 1st speech, well thought out, clear - slow down to be clearer - need to slow for emphasis. Good team together - know each other abilities & you do well together.

overall, good job by both teams. Both proficient & strong teams. As a debate Pro was more convincing, had the facts & was logical. Pro's economic data & Argument that SD US has not given democracy excellent points. Pro wins.

VPF

FLIP: 58 Chavez - Nez v. 53 Rosal - Vaillancourt

Varsity Public Forum		Amber Root (*49)			
Round 1		Room 879	Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Chavez Chavez	23	1st	Vaillancourt Vaillancourt	27
2nd	Nez Nez	22	2nd	Rosal Rosal	28
The winner of this debate was			Amber Root		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/>			Judge's Signature		
(Circle Winner)			NPP		
Is this a low point win? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

C¹ - Failure

Chavez - Try to connect to me during your ~~OPIC~~ IC

* Use Prep time *

C² - harms Cuban people

* Spend a lot more time on C² than C¹ + C³

C³ - Economic effects

* Don't let Vaillancourt bully you during questioning *
 - Try to ask questions that aren't clarification *
 * Watch your time! →

observation: uphold human rights

C¹ human rights violation
 both sub a. Human rights abuse

sub b. legitimacies
 did JFK enact it bc of human rights abuses

sub a. fear of communism
 C² - lifting has no solvency

sub. b precedent of success

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.	

52-
121

VPF

FLIP: 38 Taylor - Mance v. 50 Tefft - Schuerman

Varsity Public Forum			Bethlehem Ayalew (*26)		
Round 1			Room 421		Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Mance Tefft	29	1st	Tefft Mance	26
2nd	Tefft Schuerman	29	2nd	Schuerman Taylor	26
The winner of this debate was			Bethlehem Ayalew Judge's Signature		
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner)			ACP - Erie School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Mance

- Good clear enunciation
- Well supported arguments
- Good pathos/logos
- Good answers
- How do scams increase if they don't already exist, which then devalidates your "empirical data".
- Good reaffirmation of contentions! & elaboration
- Money/goods, the embargo costs enormous amounts of money
- No political change?

Taylor

- Good logic!!!!!!
- Good explanations
- Good job readdressing contentions
- You said "U.S. ... hasn't helped" that helped Aff a LOT.
- "OUTWEIGHED" Great word!!
- "we have statistics", where?
- GREAT EYECONTACT
- Trump became pres. last month
- Trump vs. Obama, Raul vs. Fidel good job
- Hypotheticals, "who's to say?"
- Good reaffirmations
- GREAT QUESTIONS that caught them off guard.

Tefft

- Good clear contentions
- Eye contact was good
- Good logic and warrants
- GREAT answers
- Good LOGIC!!

Schuerman


- You perfectly addressed their framework
- You had great, versatile statistics
- You connected your rebuttal to the your opponents crossfire questions.
- You maintained your calm
- Good concise answers
- Good statistics
- Your proof was superior

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.	

Ask him where his facts are from!!

VPF

FLIP: 16 Xie - Gill v. 46 Shah - Kalra

Varsity Public Forum		Jeff Gordon (*57)			
Round 1		Room 401	Fri 02/10/17 03:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>SI XIE</u>	<u>24</u>	1st	<u>Shah</u>	<u>25</u>
2nd	<u>Gill</u>	<u>27</u>	2nd	<u>Kalra</u>	<u>27</u>
The winner of this debate was Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)			 Judge's Signature <u>Basis Phx</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</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.	