


VPF

FLIP: 37 Kukunoor - Amin v. 40 Tomooka - Thomas

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | | Vismay Pandia (*25) | | |
| Round 2 | | | Room 860 | | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | <u>Thomas</u> | 21 | 1st | <u>Amin</u> | 26 |
| 2nd | <u>Tomooka</u> | 29 | 2nd | <u>Kukunoor</u> | 27 |
| The winner of this debate was | | |  Judge's Signature Mosquito School / Affiliation / Occupation | | |
| Pro Con (Circle Winner) | | | Is this a low point win? _____ | | |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PRO Both teams did not give any dates - except for one on each side - you HAVE to HAVE dates! First speech was only 3:30. 2nd speech really strong. If I look at CB analysis the Aff's bring more benefits for both US and Cuba.

CON Practice your speech. You kind of sound like a robot. Both of your speeches went over 4 minutes. In your 2nd speech you emphasize Resolution of US benefits but you only talk about Cuba benefits.

It's hard for me to buy the NEG impacts b/c if I hear what you say the arguments don't seem to outweigh the Aff benefits (Neg Neg arguments vs Aff positive Arguments) Quality of Life ↑ for Cuba and Trade increases. I cannot buy Neg infrastructure; hard to fathom.


RED: Both did a good job. How am I to buy dates when no dates? Dates could be old - I have to base my ballot in who persuaded me 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.

| | | | | | |
|---|--------|----------------|--|----------|----------------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | | Nienke Onnweeer (*41) | | |
| Round 2 | | | Room 863 | | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | Gupta | 29 | 1st | Rolfness | 30 |
| 2nd | Kandan | 29 | 2nd | Ball | 29 |
| The winner of this debate was | | |  Judge's Signature BASIL ADIWATOD EMB (1) 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 UTILITARY
 GOOD FRAMEWORK!

- HUMAN RIGHTS
- USA UNCERTAINTY
 USA UNCERTAINTY
 EMIGRATION
- GRADUAL NEGOTIATIONS
 CHINA STYLE COMMUNISM
 PREVENTION

REBUTED CHINA CARD

NEED EMBARGO AS
 NEGOTIATIONS CARD

WIN IN THEIR
 FRAMEWORK

PRO CROSS BENEFIT
 FRAMEWORK

- NORMALIZE RELATIONS
 FAIL PURPOSE

DO NOT LET CHINA TO
 STEP IN

- OIL
 NO TECHNOLOGY
 MAY CAUSE ECOLOGY
 PROBLEM FOR USA

NEED CHANGE

STATES AND

TRADE INCREASE
 WILL HELP USA PEOPLE

FAIL TO SHOW BENEFITS
 TO CURBAN PEOPLE OR
 LIFTING AN EMBARGO

OIL CARD IS SPECULATIVE


| 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. | |

TRY TO USE ELEGITIMACY
 OF EMBARGO CARD MAYBE,
 TO SHOW THE FAILURE
 OF PURPOSE IS NOT
 SUFFICIENT

CON THERE ARE
 PLENTY OF EVIDENCE
 TO SHOW BENEFITS
 OF EMBARGO FOR CURBAN
 HEALTH CARE AND AGRICULTURE.
 ALSO THERE IS EVIDENCE OF
 STRENGTHENING OF
 OPPOSITION LATELY

VPF

FLIP: 3 Strauch - Sanchez-Lonnie v. 16 Raju - Goswick

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|---|----------------|-------------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | Leah Veschio (*11) | | | |
| Round 2 | | Room 862 | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM | | |
| Speaker | Pro 1 | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con 2 | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | <u>Sanchez-Lonnie</u> | <u>26</u> | 1st | <u>Goswick</u> | <u>28</u> |
| 2nd | <u>Strauch</u> | <u>77</u> | 2nd | <u>Raju</u> | <u>29</u> |
| The winner of this debate was | | |  Judge's Signature | | |
| Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner) | | | <u>Hamilton</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation | | |
| Is this a low point win? <u>no</u> | | | | | |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

60
 Neg had more evidence and was able to refute aff's case better, good balance between offense & defense

Especially farther into the round, aff focused solely on human rights, which neg was largely able to refute - try to work on new evidence into your case instead of just repeating contentions


- also try to work with timing

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: 34 Cheng - Moriarty v. 13 Venkatachalam - Showers

| | | | |
|---|----------------------|---|---|
| Varsity Public Forum | | Kim Kunasek (#9) <i>Datalie Kujawa 20</i> | |
| Round 2 | | Room 422 | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker Con Points (20-30) |
| 1st | <u>Aimee Cheng</u> | <u>26</u> | 1st <u>Katelynn Showers</u> <u>24</u> |
| 2nd | <u>Emma Moriarty</u> | <u>30</u> | 2nd <u>Harshini Venkatachalam</u> <u>23</u> |
| The winner of this debate was | | | |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner) | |  Judge's Signature | |
| Is this a low point win? <u>No</u> | | <i>Catalina Foothills High School</i> School / Affiliation / Occupation | |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

→ I really commend you for being so gracious as you were closing for the other ~~team~~ team.

Aimee - You didn't really listen to my request to speak to me as if I had never heard the argument. You did better on cross than your opponent. You're very intense. Calm down a little and you'll be more effective.

Katelynn - You used some terms such as "quid pro" and "deleveraging the wage from 24 to 1" → I didn't know what either of those mean.

The embargo doesn't force a change it's more of a prompt to leverage change. You didn't respond to my cross questions very well. Your team really didn't provide a good example of using the embargo to leverage Cuba.

Emma - Great comment begin on the "Percent of every \$". Loved the math. You really paid attention to the points the other team made and addressed them, well done! The comment about Castro giving in not being correct bc of 40 years in place was excellent.

Harshini - You were a bit dispirited with your arguments. I'm not following your argument about the brain drain. Your argument about free trade with other countries, such as Canada, was a good point. You struggled on cross.


Emma - You were very good on cross and very professional and very effective. Great response to the question about the gas controlling the internet. You really nicely corrected Harshini on cross.

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: 41 Joseph - Delgado v. 5 Cardone - Rusk

| | | | | | |
|---|---------|----------------|--|---------|----------------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | | Syed Huq (*47) | | |
| Round 2 | | | Room 835 | | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | Cardone | 27 | 1st | Delgado | 26 |
| 2nd | Rusk | 29 | 2nd | Joseph | 23 |
| The winner of this debate was | | |  Judge's Signature Polly HS School / Affiliation / Occupation | | |
| (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u> | | | | | |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro

Con

• In the end, your card (with assoc.) just said those Cuban products were not available in U.S. may help to clarify this versus "they can't sell them"

• B speaker: you speak really quietly and unclear, had to understered

| | |
|---|-------|
| 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. | |



Regarding semantics of "reforming" vs. "lifting":

- An embargo is a set of restrictions
- Lifting some of those regulations is progress towards lifting the embargo, I find this logic inescapable.

* The only way I see that Con could have defended their reform vs. lift argument would have been to argue that the restrictions that were NOT lifted were beneficial, otherwise it's just an obvious conclusion that a little lifting → a little good = a lot of lifting → a lot of good.

VPF

FLIP: 53 Ly - Armenta v. 9 Nguyen - Schulman

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------|----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | Gerdenis Kodis (*1) | | | |
| Round 2 | | Room 825 | | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM | |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | Ly ++ | 28 | 1st | Nguyen ++ | 28 |
| 2nd | Armenta + | 26 | 2nd | Schulman +++ | 29 |
| The winner of this debate was | | | | | |
| Pro Con | | |  Judge's Signature | | |
| (Circle Winner) | | |  School / Affiliation / Occupation | | |
| Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u> | | | | | |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Pro food shortage issue was countered.
- Con cooperatives issue was novel & flowed through w/o much attack from pro.
- Issue from Pro of US oil as sub for Venezuelan oil was unclear & not advanced across the round.
- Super speakers on both sides.

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

VPF

FLIP: 35 Bawa - Kapadya v. 13 Flores - Knorr

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|---|--------------------------|----------------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | | Jana Segal (*20) | | |
| Round 2 | | | Room 823 | | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | Kapadya Knorr | 28 | 1st | Knorr Kapadya | 29 |
| 2nd | Bawa Flores | 30 | 2nd | Flores Bawa | 27 |
| 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>Yes</u> | | | _____ Bonita Visk 175 School / Affiliation / Occupation | | |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD - I decided for the con based on a few factors. PRO made a very good point on bringing up initial purpose of embargo + if it hasn't worked the embargo should be dropped. I felt they were that point. But con did a better job of demonstrating economically that the impact of lifting the embargo would be more harmful. PRO didn't really combat that as effectively. I thought the contention on Bio Tech + Medical Aid were good + interesting points but pro didn't show how important that would be should embargo be lifted. As con pointed out.

Speakers -

- Knorr - Good, clear, poised
- Flores - I thought did a fabulous job. Excellent speaking ability - had a good ability to simplify things.
- Kapadya - prepared... opportunistic... knew your stuff... great job.
- Bawa - Obviously a lot of prep + knowledge. A little frantic in style.

| | |
|---|-------|
| 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: 35 Jung - Long v. 16 DeLashmutt - Bencomo

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------|----------------|---|-----------------|----------------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | | Bethlehem Ayalew (*26) | | |
| Round 2 | | | Room 881 | | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | Chae Lin Jung | 29 | 1st | Thomas Bencomo | 28 |
| 2nd | Mindy Long | 29 | 2nd | Kyle DeLashmutt | 28 |
| The winner of this debate was <input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con <input type="radio"/> J (Circle Winner) | | | Bethlehem Ayalew Judge's Signature | | |
| Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u> | | | ACP - ERIC School / Affiliation / Occupation | | |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Jung

- Great pace
- Good follow up questions
- Great rebuttal
- Good claims
- great job!!

Bencomo

- Great pace
- Logic + fact
- Need eye contact while reading to attract.

| | |
|---|-------|
| 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. | |

Long


- Great pace
- Fact ^{good} & Logic follow-up
- Good argument, but misses points.
- More observation needed
- Slow down when you speak.

DeLashmutt

- Great pace
- well prepared and follow through
- Good logic
- Logic ^{good} application + Call out

VPF

FLIP: 20 Ackerley - Chen v. 55 Takhar - Tam

| | | | | | |
|---|--------|--|--|----------|----------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | Timothy Gorman #12 John Zimmerman (#26) | | | |
| Round 2 | | Room 833 | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM | | |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | TAKHAR | 29 | 1st | CHEN | 27 |
| 2nd | TAM | 22 | 2nd | ACKERLEY | 28 |
| The winner of this debate was | | |  Judge's Signature ACP ERIC / JUDGE 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:

BETTER OVERALL PERFORMANCE AS A TEAM WHOSE IF
 CAME TO DELIVERY, EVIDENCE & RATIONALES.
 STRONGEST PERFORMANCE NOT ON THE STRONGEST TEAM

| 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. | |

CHEN

EVIDENCE GOOD; LOTS OF SOURCES
 REASONING GOOD; EVIDENCE BACKED ARGUMENT
 DELIVERY GOOD BUT BECAME MONOTONOUS & TOO FAST
 BETTER AS SHE WENT; EYE CONTACT & SLOWED DOWN
 GOOD CROSS - EFFECTIVE SPED UP AGAIN LATER
 REBUTTAL GOOD

TAKHAR

EXCELLENT DELIVERY - BEST I HAVE SEEN TO DATE
 EVIDENCE PERSUASIVE & AUTHORITY
 REASONING EXCELLENT & WELL-PRESENTED
 REBUTTAL OK; GOT BETTER
 CROSS OK

ACKERLEY

DELIVERY VERY GOOD; FALTERED ONCE OR TWICE BUT OVERALL GREAT
 REASONING UP & DOWN; SOME GOOD, SOME LESS GOOD
 EVIDENCE SO-SO
 GOOD CROSS
 REBUTTAL STRONG

TAM

DELIVERY IS SHAKY; GOT A LITTLE LOST
 REASONING UNEVEN; SOME GOOD AND SOME PUZZLING OR CONTRADICTION
 EVIDENCE OK
 CROSS FLAWED & FALTERING
 REBUTTAL OK

99-H. Clemens The US should lift its embargo on Cuba

~~CLEMENT, TRAVIS~~

Bobcat Bonanza 2017

AFF 1 VPF 2 CON 2

FLIP: 57 Gaidici - Kirkpatrick v. 46 Shah - Kalra

| | | | |
|---|-------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | Travis Clement (*30) | |
| Round 2 | | Room 832 | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker Con Points (20-30) |
| 1st | Gaidici | 29 | 1st Shah 28 |
| 2nd | Kirkpatrick | 30 | 2nd Kalra 21 |
| The winner of this debate was | | H. Clemens Judge's Signature | |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner) | | | |
| Is this a low point win? _____ | | 99 School / Affiliation / Occupation | |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Strong framework. In the constructives some solid contentions laid out.
 Aff. excellent use of evidence, supporting arguments, and identifying a correlation vs. causation error on Neg in crossfire.
 Both teams - great clash. 2nd neg speaker - some strong arguments - especially your ?s on economy. Good coverage.
 THIS IS A STRONG substantive round. Thank you!!!

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

REF:

- AFFIRMATIVE
- Mutualism - even if Cuban people & gov.
- Economy - I buy the idea that \$ & cap goods will reach the people & that infrastruct loss & debt aren't enough to prevent. North Korea, Burma are strong empirical ex. of choke out. ~~Harder to feel Neg fully defeated the concept of scapegoating.~~
- Enhanced Aggression - aff analysis that ↑ aggression is correlated w/ easing but not caused by it was strong. The Neg defense that ↑ aggression is directly caused or an intentional response by Cuba even in status quo was too little, a bit too late.
- Liberalization econ → political stronger arguments / ev on aff.

* Would have loved this debate to be more focused on unique status quo & Paul Castro.

VPF

FLIP: 53 Rosal - Vaillancourt v. 46 Ramos - Gopal

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------|----------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | | Corrine Carlton (*16) | | |
| Round 2 | | | Room 401 | | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | <u>Gopal</u> | <u>28</u> | 1st | <u>Vaillancourt</u> | <u>26</u> |
| 2nd | <u>Ramos</u> | <u>27</u> | 2nd | <u>Rosal</u> | <u>28</u> |
| The winner of this debate was | | | | | |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner) | | | <u>Corrine Carlton</u> Judge's Signature | | |
| Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u> | | | <u>Desert Vista</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation | | |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1st speaker

- don't have typos in your case lol
- if you're going to end w/ 30 seconds left in case -> don't read so fast
- don't need to say o1 if only 1 obs
- why do you let him get away w/ saying that the people don't believe the cyber govt?
- you should probably look @ different evidence for enforcing sanctions since we don't have sanctions on Iran anymore
- you basically render your own fw obsolete w/ what you extend
- you don't quant @ of \$ going to fight terror in Iran

2nd speaker

- you need to watch your time
- don't start w/ resp to your case
- you didn't ext your cz when it was totally dropped
- I'm really not sure why you did that
- opp basically link obama leverage to removing
- you need to work on word economy

Don't talk over each other, you're on the same team.

Please make sure the evidency you're reading is readily available. It's really bad to have to drop evidence b/c you can't find it

Everyone needs to watch their timers. Almost everyone goes like 10 seconds over in at least one speech. At end of round I'm really evaluating HR b/c I don't really have @ to us being extended or clearly defined. I end up giving the round to the aff. They have more evidence about more HR abuses & democracy being undermined. It was a narrow win & both teams could have done a better job + made a win for their side easier.

1st speaker

- don't pause in the middle of your case, if reading off laptop is difficult for you then print cases
- you spoke first, so you get first question in first cf
- don't need to say o1 if only 1 obs
- you also don't need to define what the embargo
- you really should have more questions in cf

2nd speaker

- don't go back to your own case in the first rebuttal
- you need to answer their cz
- you basically just expul/obama that we should lift embargo & use lifting as negotiating chip
- you need to read more evidence in rebuttal, one and in rebuttal is not enough
- 1st speaker needs to talk during grand cf
- also not sure why you let them take first question in cf


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: 35 Sun - Zhang v. 38 Potter - Yakoob

| | | | | | |
|---|--------|--------------------|--|-------|----------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | Scott Sammons (*3) | | | |
| Round 2 | | Room 879 | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM | | |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | Potter | 29 | 1st | Sun | 28 |
| 2nd | Yakoob | 27 | 2nd | Zhang | 26 |
| 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:

- Experienced structure for both teams
- Very thorough evidence & research

Pro

- Strong support of growth of small business (key voter). Adequately refuted small improvement under Raul.
- Good pointing out of logical fallacy in final focus of "small improvements but no evidence that complete removal of embargo has no evidence" - ("cherry picking")

Con

- While pointing out the relevant point that in a Communist regime, small business only grow so much, this did not adequately refute their growth of small business points
- Adequately refuted nickel mining point
- 90% stat was a key piece of evidence which was definitely refuted

| 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 |
| 12 minutes of Prep Time per side | |
| * The first question is asked by the earlier speaker. | |

(More info on back)

VPF

FLIP: 17 Jiang - Frazey v. 46 Schaefer - Elsbecker

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------|----------------|--|--------|----------------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | | Erin Guiney (*34) | | |
| Round 2 | | | Room 870 | | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM |
| Speaker | Pro ● | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con ◦ | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | Elsbecker | 29 | 1st | Frazey | 26 |
| 2nd | Schaefer | 28 | 2nd | Jiang | 29 |
| The winner of this debate was | | | Erin Guiney Judge's Signature | | |
| Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner) | | | TEMP Prep School / Affiliation / Occupation | | |
| 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. | |

↑ recent laws
 ↑ totalitarianism; power
 ↑ to govt
 ↑ autonomy + free trade (P2B)
 1) democracy
 - sanctions → Castro
 2) doctors only 50 or many bc embargo
 - Cuba exports doctors
 3) embargo failed
 - goal: topple Castro; ≠ work
 - hurt US interests
 → Cubans affected more by embargoes
 CON
 1) ≠ throw gas on dying fire
 - ≠ embargo = no bargaining chip for reform → nonunique; embargo does nothing
 - ↑ instability + backlash
 overheat econ (grows @ unsustainable rate)
 - ↑ communism
 ↓ FT ≠ → overheating
 Cuba supports an end
 ↑ progress under 50
 Raul willing to make progress under 50
 CON: I need key voters!!
 not just another rebuttal... nice hard/softliner rhetoric, but I want to see that in-case.
 PRO: I buy your framework about the actor; not so much the doctors though.
 I don't think pursuing the 90/10 debate is helpful.
 RFD: came down to proof of corruption + govt control
 Good doctor turn.

VPF

FLIP: 30 Zhou - Chung v. 37 Vijayakumar - Samant

| | | | | | |
|---|-------|----------------|--|-------------|----------------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | | Amber Root (*49) | | |
| Round 2 | | | Room 880 | | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | Zhou | 24 | 1st | Vijayakumar | 26 |
| 2nd | Chung | 25 | 2nd | Samant | 27 |
| 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? _____ | | | | | |

52
25
43

1.47
1.31

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. | |

obs. Beneficial not Neutral

obj. No military Contraban

c'. Health issues

RFD: The Aff ended up getting lost in crossx and towards the end presented same less relevant argument

Economic Pressure

Sub B. Multilateral defeciets

@ sub. A killing terrorism?

c² decreased stability

Regime Change

* keep questions a bit more brief*

sub B Isolates U.S.

Improving Human rights

* let judges know when you use Prep

Impacts:

- promotes democracy
- Better Relation w/ Latin America
- Economic

Impacts:

- Strengthening gov't
- Deepening tactical tensions
- Empowering surveillance
- * Make sure you're enunciating*

* Don't bother specifying briefly
 both will respond to it @ w/e length they want

Samant
Try to share

VPF

FLIP: 38 Parau - Kim v. 16 Wakefield - Gustin

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | Xavier Henes (*28) | | | |
| Round 2 | | Room 882 | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM | | |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | <u>Kim</u> | <u>28</u> | 1st | <u>Eden Gustin</u> | <u>27</u> |
| 2nd | <u>Parau</u> | <u>30</u> | 2nd | <u>Jackson Wakefield</u> | <u>29</u> |
| The winner of this debate was <input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>W</u> | | | <u>Xavier Henes</u> Judge's Signature <u>Horizon 28</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation | | |


Comments & Reason for Decision:

oral K

| 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 Taylor - Mance v. 51 Yague - Dunlop

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------|-------------------|--|----------------------|-------------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | Carlos Nava (*53) | | | |
| Round 2 | | Room 837 | | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM | |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | <u>Yague</u> | <u>29</u> | 1st | <u>Mance</u> | <u>29</u> |
| 2nd | <u>Dunlop</u> | <u>29</u> | 2nd | <u>Taylor</u> | <u>29</u> |
| The winner of this debate was | | |  Judge's Signature <u>Bonita Vista H.S.</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation | | |
| (Circle Winner) Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con <input type="radio"/> Is this a low point win? _____ | | | | | |



Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both teams presented their topics in an organized manner. The Pro team was more reasonable and convincing especially during the last shot.

| 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: 20 Wicklund - Gaudet v. 47 Bauman - Deaver

| Varsity Public Forum | | | Ryan Robinson (*32) | | |
|---|------------------------|----------------|--|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Round 2 | | | Room 878 | | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | <u>Maggie Bauman</u> | <u>29</u> | 1st | <u>Amy Gaudet</u> | <u>26</u> |
| 2nd | <u>Courtney Deaver</u> | <u>27</u> | 2nd | <u>Chloe Wicklund</u> | <u>28</u> |
| The winner of this debate was | | |  Judge's Signature  School / Affiliation / Occupation | | |
| (Circle Winner) Pro Con Is this a low point win? <u>no</u> | | | | | |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

low use in the word
 very strong speaker 4 speech low use of
 analysis & explanation of the evidence

Argument of prostitution from Lx was good.
 Needed to see more like it in round from Con.

RFD. The prostitution argument was won by Pro
 in their sustained 5c&2 attack.

Firm left w/ environment & medicine.

I think Pro makes a stronger case that lifting
 the embargo saves lives. The con was referencing health care
 costs explicitly stating problems are a result of even
 shortages & "The Emergency." Con did not argue

stronger than this in the evidence & its impact.
 for this reason I vote Pro.



Both side will vote to your winning issues.

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: 37 Sidapara - Niu v. 58 Wieck - Razor

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------------|--|-------|----------------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | | James Gish (*5) | | |
| Round 2 | | | Room 836 | | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | View | 27 | 1st | Wieck | 24 |
| 2nd | Sudabara | 28 | 2nd | Razor | 27 |
| The winner of this debate was | | |  Judge's Signature  School / Affiliation / Occupation | | |
| (Circle Winner) Pro Con Is this a low point win? _____ | | | | | |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1) Scapesent
 2) Oil - Economic benefit to US - great point!
 3) Trade - leading U.S. trade?
 - I don't think all of the logic in this point is sound. Slam for logical fallacies!
 I need your closing statement of open statement
 - strong defense
 - Since when do opponents give their care about justifying all of their actions?
 - You're starting with a logical fallacy of causality
 - Very clear points - thank you
 - Excellent evidence
 - Great speeches


Can't
 • Not not requirements to lift
 • Immoral to abandon rights
 • May entangle Lib
 Wieck - Great speaking
 - Wieck don't look at competitor so much!
 • Is the prohibition fairly not immoral as well
 • Not all of your evidence actually enforce your 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. | |

- Thanks for road map.
 - The country is NOT 100% controlled by gov.
 - I need hard evidence that the has been worthy for democracy - put your money where your mouth is.
 - Great point! No! Time run out!
 I wanted to hear that point

VPF

FLIP: 46 Cardellini - Coben v. 50 Tefft - Schuerman

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-------------------|--|------------|----------------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | | Sherry Meng (*17) | | |
| Round 2 | | | Room 866 | | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | Tefft | 27 | 1st | Coben | 27 |
| 2nd | Schuerman | 29 | 2nd | Cardellini | 28 |
| The winner of this debate was | | |  Judge's Signature Corona del Sol, parent School / Affiliation / Occupation | | |
| (Pro) Con (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>no</u> | | | | | |


Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both had great arguments. However, neg is missing some links in some key claims. For example, neg claimed that lifting embargo will allow cuba to trade w/ other countries not friendly to us. However, that is more reasonable w/ embargo. How would lifting embargo furthers this relationship is a little confusing. Con also conceded embargo not working, but claim it would be worse without it. This goes back to the missing link mentioned above.

| | |
|---|-------|
| 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: 43 Wang - Samin v. 30 Khan - Patel

| | | | | | |
|---|-------|----------------|--|-------|----------------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | | Tristan Brown (*46) | | |
| Round 2 | | | Room 421 | | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | Wang | 27 | 1st | Khan | 29 |
| 2nd | Samir | 26 | 2nd | Patel | 30 |
| The winner of this debate was | | |  Judge's Signature Brophy College Prep School / Affiliation / Occupation | | |
| Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner) | | | | | |
| Is this a low point win? <u>nope</u> | | | | | |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

- need evidence/warrant that Cuba will turn to US post-embargo and why that will either lower HRUs or make things better in Cuba.
- Make Russia/China a key voter, it's a big part of your case, especially since you conceded that Econ liberalism and political freedom are mutually exclusive, which hurts you since human rights were your one key voter
- defend your own case in the rebuttal, not just attacking theirs.

Neg

- you win on strength of rebuttal and summary, but a lot of your final focus arguments (diplomatic relations increasing HRUs, embargo acting as reward) weren't brought up a lot throughout the round so they couldn't get fleshed out.
- Say how things will change w/c of embargo, you have a steep burden of proof in that regard


| | |
|---|-------|
| 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. | |

Great Round!

VPF

FLIP: 16 Fiber - Lane v. 13 Chen - Reddie

forfeit

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------|---|----------------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | Anna Skinner (*38) | |
| Round 2 | | Room 402 | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker |
| | | | Con |
| 1st | _____ | _____ | 1st _____ |
| 2nd | _____ | _____ | 2nd _____ |
| The winner of this debate was | | | |
| Pro Con (Circle Winner) | |  Judge's Signature | |
| Is this a low point win? _____ | | Basis / teacher School / Affiliation / Occupation | |


Comments & Reason for Decision:

*Fiber 4
 round win
 by forfeit.*

| 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: 16 Xie - Gill v. 35 Wang - Ramesh

| | | | | | |
|--|------|---|---|--------|----------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | Christine Thiele (*58) | | | |
| Round 2 ^{120th} 90th | | Room 839 ^{120th} 90th | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM | | |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (20-30) |
| ^{Speaker 1} ② 1st | XIE | 28 | ^{Speaker 1} ① 1st | WANG | 28 |
| ④ 2nd | GILL | 29 | ③ 2nd | RAMESH | 28 |
| The winner of this debate was | | |  Judge's Signature GCA / Systems Analyst School / Affiliation / Occupation | | |
| Pro Con (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u> | | | | | |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- (EVEN)** SP1 WANG - Good use of sources, framework is well-defined. Excellent speaking skills
- SP2 - Ditto
- (EVEN)** CROSS 1/2 - XIE - Excellent on-the-fly questions and answers. WANG - Primarily questioning. Both EXCELLENT
- (EVEN)** SP3 ~~RAMESH~~ RAMESH - Excellent job picking apart PRO'S case. Convincing. Best speaker so far.
- (PRO)** SP4 GILL - Good use of data/sources. Good rebuttals of CON'S case.
- (PRO)** CROSS 3/4 - Ramesh interrupting Gill. Gill is strong and convincing. Ramesh is on the defense. Gill stayed on offense and responded well to every question
- (EVEN)** SP1 Summary WANG - Good point-by-point critique of ~~PRO'S case~~. PRO'S case
- SP2 Summary XIE - Good challenge to CON
- (PRO)** GRAND CROSS - Strong rebuttals by GILL in response to CON'S repeated questioning. PRO trying to keep up with CON.
- (PRO)** SP3 FF RAMESH - Good use of examples parallel to Cuba's situation. but not convincing. Loud but not convincing.
- (PRO)** SP4 FF GILL - Good detailed wrap up highlighting most important 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. | |

RFD - Very evenly matched. I was most impressed with Gill's handling of the crosses. In my opinion, Gill's responses won the debate for PRO

DENIGER, DANNY

1st

con

(R)

VPF

1st

Pro


2nd

(L)

1st

Bobcat Bonanza 2017

FLIP: 46 Vaughn - Gonzales v. 49 Jasso - Kief

| | | | | | |
|---|-------|----------------|---|----------|----------------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | | Danny Deniger (*19) | | |
| Round 2 | | | Room 868 | | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | Kief | 30 | 1st | Gonzales | 29 |
| 2nd | Jasso | 30 | 2nd | Vaughn | 29 |
| 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:

- Pro - "My partner will answer in his rebuttal" is not a good CX answer... don't cop out just b/c I'm not planning
- No time spent on your own case in Rebuttal?
 - I liked your summary a lot. Looked clean on flow and neatly summarized voters. Framed the rest of the round.


- con - Good blocks in rebuttal - possibly too good.
- It would be helpful if you separated harms of communism vs. harms of embargo
- Rebuttal was strong but you rode some weak in-case arguments through the rest of the debate

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

RFD: I voted Pro because their impacts to diplomacy and public health outweighed their threats of "legitimization" and promotion of terrorism. It was a close debate, both teams were great.

VPF

FLIP: 57 Henden - Gordon v. 53 Casey - Jazo

| | | | | | |
|---|-------|----------------------|---|--------|-------------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | Sabrina Porter (*55) | | | |
| Round 2 | | Room 875 | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM | | |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | Jazo | 28 | 1st | Gordon | 26 |
| 2nd | Casey | 29 | 2nd | Henden | 27 |
| The winner of this debate was | | |  Judge's Signature 55 - Business Owner School / Affiliation / Occupation | | |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u> | | | | | |


Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both teams were well prepared & did a nice job articulating their case. Pro did a better job ^{refuting} addressing each point made by the con team & also providing support for their framework & values. Hard call but I'm giving it to Pro team. Nice work both teams.

| | |
|---|-------|
| ✓ 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: 53 Neuner - Rivera v. 55 Tehranchi - Afework

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|-------------------|---|------------------|----------------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | | Jeff Gordon (*57) | | |
| Round 2 | | | Room 869 | | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | Kassra | 27 | 1st | Raquel Rivera | 27 |
| 2nd | Kaleb | 20 | 2nd | Katherine Neuner | 27 |
| The winner of this debate was | | |  Judge's Signature | | |
| (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>N</u> | | | Double win per N Tab Basis Phx School / Affiliation / Occupation | | |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The argument for opening up trade forces more jobs, both private/public, thus continuing to improve the private sector

| 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: 20 Liaupsin - Little v. 58 Chavez - Nez

| | | | |
|--|---------------|--|-----------------------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | Rachel Fromm (*40) | |
| Round 2 | | Room 865 | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker |
| 1st | <u>Chavez</u> | <u>25</u> | 1st <u>Liaupsin A.</u> |
| 2nd | <u>Nez</u> | <u>26</u> | 2nd <u>Little B.</u> |
| 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> | | _____ Hamilton School / Affiliation / Occupation | |

AKA
 1:43
 - 27
 1:16

31
 KFA
 HBA

Comments & Reason for Decision:

verbal RFD given

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

VPF

FLIP: 30 Cohen - Cohen v. 50 Alam - Corrigan

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|-------------------|---|----------|----------------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | | Mary-Jo Okawa (*37) | | |
| Round 2 | | | Room 876 | | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | J. Cohen | 28 | 1st | Alam | 25 |
| 2nd | S. Cohen | 27 | 2nd | Corrigan | 24 |
| The winner of this debate was | | | Judge's Signature | | |
| <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> Pro Con </div> (Circle Winner) | | | BASIS Scottsdale / Teacher School / Affiliation / Occupation | | |
| 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. | |

- PRO was much more effective in articulating their points. For example, lifting the embargo would provide U.S. with more influence and bargaining power while also bolstering our values and input into the culture, government and economy.
- CON had difficulty refuting and disproving this point.
- CON cited sources but not clearly. Whereas PRO cited sources but failed to provide dates.
- CON failed to support arguments such as "Cuba simply won't pay debts."
- PRO was more effective at rebutting assertions and evidence.
- CON seemed confused and flustered during crossfire.

VPF

FLIP: 16 Aberg - Braun v. 20 Labenz - Wallace

| | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------------------|--|---------|-------------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | Paul Meade (*35) | | | |
| Round 2 | | Room 403 | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM | | |
| Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | Braun | 29 | 1st | Wallace | 26 |
| 2nd | Aberg | 28 | 2nd | Labenz | 27 |
| The winner of this debate was | | |  Judge's Signature HAMILTON School / Affiliation / Occupation | | |
| (Circle Winner) Pro Con Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u> | | | | | |


Comments & Reason for Decision:

VERBAL COMMENTS PROVIDED
 BOTH TEAMS NEEDED TO IMPROVE QUANTIFIED IMPACTS
 PRO DID A BETTER JOB OF FLOW AND DEFENSE OF CONTENTIONS.

| 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. | |

Chisti, Amira h VPF

FLIP: 32 Carr - Hughes v. 20 Capin - Stebner

| | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------|---|------------------------|----------------|
| Varsity Public Forum | | Sidharth Kulkarni (*43) | | | |
| Round 2 | | Room 827 | Fri 02/10/17 05:00PM | | |
| Speaker | Con Con (2) | Points (20-30) | Speaker | Pro Pro (1) | Points (20-30) |
| 1st | Hughes | 29 | 1st | Capin | 29 |
| 2nd | Carr | 29 | 2nd | Stebner | 29 |
| The winner of this debate was | | |  Judge's Signature BASIS Chandler. School / Affiliation / Occupation | | |
| Pro (Circled) (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. | |

Con

- I am impressed w/ your first contention on environmental reefs, difficult to refute
- when you mention Obama's lifts and how they increase aggression, it would help to cite some specific examples.
- good on sex tourism
- good on questioning how Cuba will become liberalized
- ~~same as your friend~~
- not completely seeing the link
- didn't really talk about economy

Pro

- good starts w/ political uprising
- need evidence
- adding to that, good link from self employment factor to economy.
- lol we can't take care of our own environment & ~~reject~~ global warming we won't care about coral reefs if it means ↑ businesses.
- you had a really good point on internet!! But you mentioned it in summary!! :f

Con / Pro
1:28 / 1:05

→ did not have proper rebuttal

Con

* I know evidence is really hard to get!