


VESCHIO, LEAH

PRO - (2) - my prep  
Con (2) - opp. preptime  
Bobcat Bonanza 2017  
VPF

FLIP: 9 Nguyen - Schulman v. 46 Shah - Kalra

Varsity Public Forum		Leah Veschio (*11)			
Round 3		Room 825	Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Nguyen	30	1st	Shah	27
2nd	Schulman	29	2nd	Kalra	20
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature 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:

Shaw (Con) - <sup>not</sup> lifting embargo  
focus on economics  
- good opening statement  
- strong argument

Nguyen (Pro) - Excellent use of statistics  
+ sources. Well written.  
Used your opening quote - something different

CF #1 Pro took this CF

Kalra - made 2 reinf. com. govern

CF #2 - Pro took this CF

Pro won debate - more organized, stronger arguments & good references. They make a good team

The con team did a great job - work on refining your arguments. Both good speakers

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

Pro/Con

VPF

FLIP: 20 Labenz - Wallace v. 16 Xie - Gill

Varsity Public Forum			ErIn Guiney (*34)		
Round 3			Room 878		Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Wallace	27	1st	Xie	28
2nd	Labenz	26	2nd	Gill	29
The winner of this debate was					
Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con			ErIn Guiney		
(Circle Winner)			Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? NO			Tempe Prep		
			School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Switch speaking order!

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.	

# detriment to us

Pro

Con

- 1) diplomatic rep
- allies against embargo
- ↑ stability
- ↳ # embargo ↑ Cuban rtshp
- 2) agri industries
- dependent on US exports
- ↑ trade relations
- losing \$ w/ embargo

- 1) embargo = leverage
- UAV
- more \$ @ Cuba = ↑ communism
- 2) ≠ embargo ↑ oppression
- \$ → Castro regime if no embargo
- US investments in Cuba pass Castros, not workers (can't be solved by US)
- embargo means US not willing to budge
- Cuban econ hurt by embargo = success

Cuban US interests



KV: intl affairs  
 - US needs to listen to popular opinion + lift embargo

KV: intl relations  
 - US embargo vs Cuba in line w/ US charter  
 KV2: Cuban interests >> (intl response: none)  
 "peanuts"

RFD: con extended key voters throughout; did better job offensively against pro

# VPF

FLIP: 13 Venkatachalam - Showers v. 32 Carr - Hughes

Varsity Public Forum		Xavier Henes (*28)			
Round 3		Room 875	Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Showers</u>	<u>27</u>	1st	<u>Hughes</u>	<u>30</u>
2nd	<u>Venkatachalam</u>	<u>25</u>	2nd	<u>Carr</u>	<u>29</u>
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature  School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con Is this a low point win? <u>Yes</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:


Don't say that deprivation of medications for treating AID's and Cancer is less bad then not having rights. That just doesn't fly.

Affirmative needs to work on fluency and creating more cohesive arguments in rebuttal

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. 41 Joseph - Delgado

Varsity Public Forum			Sherry Meng (*17)		
Round 3			Room 868		Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Delgado</u>	<u>25</u>	1st	<u>Mance</u>	<u>26</u>
2nd	<u>Joseph</u>	<u>20</u>	2nd	<u>Taylor</u>	<u>27</u>
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature <u>Corona del Sol parent</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>no.</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro's cases were a little far fetched. Need to better understand the scope of the data.  
 Con's arguments were reasonable.


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.	

MEADE, PAUL  
 KOLSHORN, PETER

Bobcat Bonanza 2017

**VPF**

FLIP: 30 Khan - Patel v. 40 Ball - Rolfness

Varsity Public Forum		Peter Kolshorn (*53)	
Round 3		Room 866	Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker
	SECOND		Con
1st	Khan	25	1st
			Rolfness
2nd	Patel	28	2nd
			Ball
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner)		HAMILTON School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

COMMENTS PROVIDED VERBALLY


PRO EFFECTIVELY USED OPPONENTS FRAMEWORK

CON LACKED IMPACTS, LACKED WARRANTS.  
 WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF LIFTING EMBARGO TO US CITIZENS?  
 SOLID LOGIC AND VALUES - MORE SUITABLE TO LD.

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. 46 Ramos - Gopal

<b>Varsity Public Forum</b>			<b>Benjamin Ladick (*47)</b>		
<b>Round 3</b>			<b>Room 837</b>		<b>Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM</b>
Speaker	<b>Pro</b>	Points (20-30)	Speaker	<b>Con</b>	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Frazey</u>	<u>27</u>	1st	<u>Gopal</u>	<u>27</u>
2nd	<u>Jiang</u>	<u>27</u>	2nd	<u>Ramos</u>	<u>27</u>
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature <u>Catalina Foothills High School</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

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

Frazey → You spoke so fast I almost couldn't understand you. Good question about how the embargo has worked. ~~Understand your question~~ Your scapegoat question is good.

You were both sorta of keeping arguing over each other on cross.

Gopal → It seems like you're talking about all the bad alliances Cuba has but not necessarily how maintaining the embargo is preventing bad stuff from happening. I wish you'd focused more on how the US could leverage the embargo to effect change. Your response to the solving corruption question was good. You didn't really answer the scapegoat question all that well. Oppression will exist either way as a good point.


Jiang → The argument about the Cuban military not rebelling was good. You really countered that argument well. You brought the argument back around to your initial point very well. I'm not really following the Venezuela aspect of your argument. It doesn't seem like that was ever explained. I like your point about Latin America not liking the US because of the embargo. You were a little better on cross - slowly trending towards capitalizing. You had a good close but went a little off at the end.

Ramos → Good point about the US reaching out to Cuba and Cuba not behaving. You kind of tried to cram too much into your time and it was actually difficult to follow. The spreading more of communism is a good argument. That's true that they didn't disprove that industry is controlled by the military.

In the end, the Pro side just did a little better at presenting its arguments clearly and cohesively.

# VPF

FLIP: 16 Fiber - Lane v. 50 Alam - Corrigan

Varsity Public Forum		Scott Sammons (*3)			
Round 3		Room 863	Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Alam	28	1st	Lane	29
2nd	Corrigan	25	2nd	Fiber	29
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)			Tolleson Union		
Is this a low point win? No			School / Affiliation / Occupation		

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.	

- A key aspect of this debate was when the Con team set up the definition of of a sanction as something that is put into place until genuine change occurs. This was never challenged adequately.
- Key Exchange: When Con asked the question "Why will the U.S. foreign investment bring democratization if current foreign investment doesn't?" The dodge of this question was blundered by the Pro team.
- Both teams had thorough research and good empirical evidence with legitimate sources
- A very important point within the Con argument was that the ongoing embargo provide the U.S. leverage with the Cuban government. While the Pro team attempted to discredit it, their argument was largely unsubstantiated.

VPF

FLIP: 55 Tehranchi - Afework v. 53 Ly - Armenta

Varsity Public Forum			Mikkaela Salamatın (*5)		
Round 3			Room 827		Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Ly	20.5	1st	Tehranchi	27.5
2nd	Armenta	27	2nd	Afework	28
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Mohave High School School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

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: you can't NOT explain how much aid U.S. is giving then claim abuse if/when Con supposedly can't name lifted portions. Also, PRO has burden of proof; NOT CON.

RFD: Both sides try to claim same voters but ultimately Con does a better job of imparting in the world. Also, there were a few too many unaddressed issues ON PRO case.



# VPF

FLIP: 16 DeLashmutt - Bencomo v. 20 Wicklund - Gaudet

Varsity Public Forum			Matthew McCulley (*46)		
Round 3			Room 401		Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Tomas Bencomo	28	1st	Amy Gaudet	27
2nd	kyle Delashmutt	30	2nd	Chloe Wicklund	28
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			Brophy Prep School / Affiliation / Occupation		



Comments & Reason for Decision:

Con's evidence was outdated  
 Pro refuted a major point of their argument.  
 Pro used more facts and had a better hold on the argument.

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 Zhou - Chung v. 55 Takhar - Tam

Varsity Public Forum			Christine Thiele (*58)		
Round 3			Room 836		Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Takhar, Bikram	29	1st	Zhou, Amy	30
2nd	Tam, Alex	29	2nd	Chung, Thomas	30
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? <u>NO</u>					


Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both teams were very well prepared and arguments were sound with well thought out researched evidence. Pro teams contention 2 sub point B on infrastructure is very good. Con team's argument 2 US hegemony sub point 2 that the embargo has not done it's job went uncontested. Con's argument that the embargo <sup>is</sup> not satisfied because Cuba's government has not complied with its primary points was strong and not attacked by pro team

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 Capin - Stebner v. 49 Jasso - Kief

Varsity Public Forum			Nienke Onneweer (*41)		
Round 3			Room 832		Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM
Speaker	Pro / Con	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Capin	25	1st	Kief	30
2nd	Stebner	28	2nd	Jasso	30
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)			Hamilton School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

you are  
 you ~~are~~ the first team ~~to~~ made  
 a pun u

one of the primary problems in this round is  
 that the aff dropped the neg arg about  
 embargo use as political leverage in the  
 rebuttal, & the neg goes p hard on that  
 arg <sup>summary</sup>

also Capin - you get v heated in round bro u gotta chill  
 aff also dropped neg cd about intellectual property  
 - the general econ block wasn't sufficient

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.	

29

18

# VPF

FLIP: 53 Casey - Jazo v. 16 Wakefield - Gustin

Varsity Public Forum			Vismay Pandia (*25)		
Round 3			Room 839		Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Jazo	29	1st	Gustin	28
2nd	Casey	29	2nd	Wakefield	29
The winner of this debate was					
<p><b>Pro</b> Con (Circle Winner)</p> <p>Is this a low point win? _____</p>			<p><i>Vismay Pandia</i> Judge's Signature</p> <p>Desert Mountain School / Affiliation / Occupation</p>		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Voted Pro on cost-benefit analysis given economic FW

~~Con~~ Con: don't concede FW

Notes

- Value of cost-benefit analysis of lifting embargo:

- Pro debates that lifting will provide benefit for both countries

- Con argued .5% GDP increase on worth it → mistake b/c conceded

FW

- Gov controls debate:

• Pro stated solvency is lifting embargo → Harvard Political Review 16 → really sound evidence

• Con needed to reassure that changes have been made (Food/Medicine) but not gov

Controls change

- Econ:

Pro → Harvard Political Review / Cuba good trading partner

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.	

1:03

29

1:47

56

# VPF

FLIP: 38 Parau - Kim v. 51 Yague - Dunlop

Varsity Public Forum			Sabrina Porter (*55)		
Round 3			Room 879		Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Ndeye Yague	29	1st	Seonoon Kim	29
2nd	Emily Dunlop	27	2nd	David Parau	30
The winner of this debate was					
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/>			Zachary Weidert		
(Circle Winner)			Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>			Brophy		
			School / Affiliation / Occupation		

50 sec.

54 sec.

Comments & Reason for Decision:


- P -
- benefit economy
  - increase trade
  - better healthcare for Cubans
  - Embargo violates Int'l law
  - U.S. will have access to better pro environmental resources
  - oil spills will be avoided
  - embargo restricts negotiations
  - tourism will increase jobs and better the economy

- C -
- Cuba turning towards Democracy already
  - foreign investment will ruin progressive movement
  - political instability
  - Hazardous drilling
  - negative environmental impact
  - Human rights still oppressed
  - Embargo applies pressure to Castro regime
  - accelerates ~~authoritarianism~~ authoritarianism
  - causes moral and economic issues
  - Cubans don't favor Americans
  - Embargo applies leverage
  - can ~~still~~ still provide aid to Cubans
  - not suited f
  - very risky, already working

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: 50 Tefft - Schuerman v. 53 Neuner - Rivera

Varsity Public Forum		Rachel Fromm (*40)	
Round 3		Room 835	Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM
Speaker	<b>Pro</b>	Points (20-30)	Speaker
1st	Austin Tefft	28	1st Raquel Rivera
2nd	Amanda Schuerman	30	2nd Katherine Neuner
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature P-VHS Teacher School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Circle Winner)		Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PRO ① / CON ② nd. negate.

Austin \*slow down just a little to enunciate better.

① ineffective - 4,500 still trade/prvide services

② alternatives work better → leads to democratization

③ benefits - economic ex. increase revenue - protect environment

Raquel \* Good enunciation

① release prisoners - Goal of embargo to increase human rights. - no freedom of expression; subjects to arbitrary arrests.

② counterproductive - will strengthen Castro's gov. + will not ~~make~~ make things better for the people.

Katherine \* clear speaker - maximize human rights → not nec. Democratization

trade → democratization ⊕

- not open to U.S. relations tourism → not unique

- funds ↓ - normal relationships have done nothing.

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.	


Amanda ~~clear~~ clear speaker, passionate.

- causing problems  
 - how quality of life is maximized  
 - Human Rights → hurting ppl with embargo  
 - embargo ≠ solution.

continued

VPF

FLIP: 37 Vijayakumar - Samant v. 43 Wang - Samin

Varsity Public Forum		Scott Schuerman (*50)			
Round 3 <del>2017</del>		Room 862 <del>2017</del>	Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>VIJAYAKUMAR</u>	<u>29</u>	1st	<u>WANG</u>	<u>28</u>
2nd	<u>SAMANT</u>	<u>29</u>	2nd	<u>SAMIN</u>	<u>27</u>
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature <u>GCA/Systems Analyst</u> 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.	

- (EVEN)** SP1 VIJAY - Basic framework, acceptable presentation
- (EVEN)** SP2 WANG - Good use of examples and sources, fair
- (PRO)** CROSS 1/2 - Wang unable to respond to Vijay regarding UN ~~condemnation~~ condemnation of US. PRO - some questionable figures but CON did not challenge.
- (PRO)** SP3 SAMANT - A lot of good examples given to bolster PRO's case and poke holes in CON's case although some examples given were not convincing. MIXED
- (PRO)** SP4 SAMIN - Some good points, too, but not as convincing as PRO. SAMIN needs to up his speaking style.
- (PRO)** CROSS 3/4 - SAMANT controlled the cross with strong questioning while SAMIN provided weak responses. SAMIN's responses were weak and limp.
- (PRO)** SP1 Summary VIJAY - Good point-by-point critique of CON. well done.
- (PRO)** SP2 Summary WANG - weak, weak arguments. Wang did not demonstrate confidence in her own arguments.
- (EVEN)** Grand Cross - Neither side was impressive on grand cross. Both sides seemed somewhat confused.
- (PRO)** SP3 FF - SAMANT - Good, convincing reasons for not maintaining the embargo
- (PRO)** SP4 FF - SAMIN - Acceptable rebuttal to PRO and fair wrap-up

RFD - PRO's arguments were strong and overwhelming and both team members were well-prepared. CON didn't fight back and provide strong responses to PRO's challenges. SORRY - this wasn't even close. SAMIN needs to be more CONFIDENT

VPF

FLIP: 13 Flores - Knorr v. 20 Ackerley - Chen

Varsity Public Forum			Bethlehem Ayalaw (*26)		
Round 3			Room 870		Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Knorr</u>	<u>29</u>	1st	<u>Chen</u>	<u>27</u>
2nd	<u>Flores</u>	<u>29</u>	2nd	<u>Ackerley</u>	<u>27</u>
The winner of this debate was					
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner)			<u>Bethlehem Ayalaw</u> Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			<u>ACP Erie</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Knorr

- + Good eye contact
- + Brought a lot of facts to reinforce support
- + Great pace
- Give time to get answers for your question
- + Reinforced all points in summary

Chen

- + Good Intro
- + Great eye contact
- + follow up - enforces points
- + Great reinforcement

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

- + Great detailed intro w/ good pace
- + good follow up questions
- Give time for follow-up question
- + Good job pointing out weak points to reinforce your strength


Ackerley

- + Very well prepared to re
- + Good eye contact shows confidence
- + Good evidence to support claim
- need to follow through w/ answers - don't lose your point
- loses focus / misses the window of opportunity to restate point
- + points out weakness + reinforce w/ +ve.



# VPF

FLIP: 30 Cohen - Cohen v. 13 Chen - Reddie

Varsity Public Forum		Taylor Swanson (*35)			
Round 3		Room 421		Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM	
Speaker	Pro 1	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con 2	Points (20-30)
1st	Cohen, J.	27	1st	Reddie	28
2nd	Cohen, S.	28	2nd	Chen	29
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Hamilton School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

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


make sure to really tie in how each contention is directly influenced by the embargo - effects of being a scapegoat were also a little unclear on the aff side

both sides should also make sure to address new points that have been brought up, not just the original contentions

Overall, really good round thanks for debating!

VPF

FLIP: 46 Cardellini - Coben v. 53 Rosal - Vaillancourt

Varsity Public Forum		<del>Geordie Kodis (#14)</del> JOHN ZIMMERMANN (#26)			
Round 3		Room 876	Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	COBEN	29	1st	VAILLANCOURT	24
2nd	CARDELLINI	27	2nd	ROSAL	24
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature ACP-ERIE / JUDGE School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con <input type="radio"/> Is this a low point win? <input type="checkbox"/>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

BETTER PRESENTATION, REASONING, REBUTAL & CROSS-EXAMINATION

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.	

COBEN EVIDENCE GOOD & GOT EVEN BETTER  
 REASONING GOOD  
 DELIVERY GOOD - ARTICULATE, OCCASIONALLY FAST  
 GOT EVEN BETTER AS HE WENT  
 EXCELLENT CROSS QUESTIONING  
 VERY GOOD JOB w/ REBUTAL


VAILLANCOURT  
 EVIDENCE OK  
 REASONING NOT CLEARLY CORRELATED; SOME ARGUMENTS FLAWED  
 DELIVERY OK; OFTEN TOO FAST LEADING TO TROUBLE UNDERSTANDING  
 OCCASIONAL EMPHASIS AND EYE CONTACT  
 DECENT REBUTAL  
 OK CROSS

CARDELLINI  
 EVIDENCE STRONG  
 REASONING VERY STRONG  
 DELIVERY VERY GOOD, THOUGH IT DRIFTED INTO MONOTONE & TOO FAST PLACE  
 GOOD CROSS - BACKED OPPONENT INTO A CORNER  
 GOOD JOB w/ REBUTAL

ROSAL  
 EVIDENCE OK  
 REASONING UNEVEN; STRONG AT TIMES & A REACH IN OTHERS  
 DELIVERY STRONG, IF FAST AT TIMES  
 CROSS UNEVEN; TALKED OVER OPPONENT AND MADE COMMENT IN FORM OF QUESTION

# VPF

FLIP: 20 Liaupsin - Little v. 35 Jung - Long

Varsity Public Forum		Jeff Gordon (*57)			
Round 3		Room 860	Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM		
Speaker	Pro <del>2nd</del>	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Liaupsin A.	28	1st	Chaelin Jung	27
2nd	Little B.	28	2nd	Mindy Long	26
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature BASIS Phx School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>					


Comments & Reason for Decision:

Con failed to overcome that NO side in food & medicine is a HR violation and the exploitate of the US Gov't cherry picking trades favourable to the US on their donors.

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: 5 Cardone - Rusk v. 58 Wieck - Rasor

Varsity Public Forum			Lamar Hunt (*38)		
Round 3			Room 833		Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Cardone	28	1st	Wieck	23
2nd	Rusk	29	2nd	Rasor	23
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Boss Pedro / Parents / Medical Sales School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Pro) Con (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____					


Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro was in control on all points and was able to refuse any rebuttals to their arguments. Con at times contradicted their own points.

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 Schaefer - Eisbecker v. 16 Raju - Goswick

Varsity Public Forum		Ryan Robinson (*32)			
Round 3		Room 882	Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Eisbecker</u>	<u>27</u>	1st	<u>Goswick</u>	<u>29</u>
2nd	<u>Schaefer</u>	<u>28</u>	2nd	<u>Raju</u>	<u>30</u>
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature <u>Schwarz H.S.</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input type="radio"/> <b>Con</b> <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? <u>NO.</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Speaker 3 - Good analysis on Democratism argument  
 i ev. Van

Speaker 4 - Good job proving issues in Gov. Legitimacy with  
 agree to free trade - Summary Speaker did  
 a good job ex proving this argument.


Good Rebut. Both sides focused on Delta rather than  
 Brecht & used strong analysis.

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.	

Cons analysis on the 90-10% split & the  
 moving it to the left in a relative exchange made  
 a strong case. Their argument that can stagnates  
 H.P. violations was not as well as well as  
 not was the argument that Legitimacy wasn't  
 being met. For this reason I vote Con.

VPF

FLIP: 3 Strauch - Sanchez-Lonnie v. 16 Aberg - Braun

Varsity Public Forum		Amber Root (*49)			
Round 3		Room 869	Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Sanchez Lonnie	25	1st	Braun	29
2nd	Strauch	26	2nd	Aberg	28
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? _____					

25-  
40-  
(55)

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.	

C<sup>1</sup> - Modern Concensus  
- UN is against

e<sup>c</sup> US human right violation

C<sup>3</sup> Benefits US + Cuba

\* Seems odd that you C<sup>2</sup> hold the Cuba suffers bc of Embargo health wise and C<sup>3</sup> holds that Cuban Medicine is top

\* Try to restate case in own words \*

\* Try to stay organized

C<sup>1</sup> Normalie is bad for US.


impacts - workers Exploited  
- Slavery in Police State  
- Cuban investment unreliable

C<sup>2</sup> Last leverage US has

~~Pass~~ = very Congress-y

(R) VPF (L)

FLIP: 38 Potter - Yakooob v. 35 Kandan - Gupta

Varsity Public Forum			Danny Deniger (*19)		
Round 3			Room 865		Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Gupta	27	1st	Potter	27
2nd	Kandan	27	2nd	Yakooob	29
The winner of this debate was			 Judges Signature Shadon Mtn School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PRO - L  
 Constructive -  
 (\*) Not sure you should cite Huff Po - pretty well known bias.  
 Rebuttal - Good responses all the way down.  
 (\*) I'm concerned no one is talking about Con observation 3...  
 (\*) Your oil technology impact seems pretty weak - missing a good warrant

CON - R  
 (\*) Constructive - hit your tangents harder when you speak, you lost me for a second between sex tourism & biodiversity.  
 (\*) Make sure you're timed and can read it all.  
 Rebuttal - Your speaking style is really great for PFD. I think you minimized Latin America.  
 (\*) too much at first but I'm glad it came back later.  
 (\*) Still confused about how your 2nd observation survived this round

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

(\*) No one is doing a good job of quantifying how tourism might change  
 (\*) Lot of clash about Latin America but the impacts really got lost by FF

(\*) If con flowed OBS 3 through at any point it would have been auto-win. Watch out for that abusive stuff.

This is my impact calc to Cuban quality of life:

<p><u>Pro</u></p> <p>(weak) - oil spills                  (no impact) - oppression of democracy in status quo                  (good impact but didn't talk about it) - China primacy in L.A.</p>	<p><u>Con</u></p> <p>Tourism (maybe)                  - Brain drain (seemed like new arg to me)</p>
---	---

RFD: Surprisingly the most well defined impact was Tourism. (and talked about)  
 I vote Con, it was a close Debate ;)

VPF

FLIP: 40 Tomooka - Thomas v. 58 Chavez - Nez

Varsity Public Forum			Corrine Carlton (*16)		
Round 3			Room 881		Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Thomas	28	1st	Chavez	25
2nd	Tomooka	29	2nd	NEZ	25
The winner of this debate was					
<p style="text-align: center;">(Pro) Con (Circle Winner)</p>			<p style="text-align: center;">Corrine Carlton Judge's Signature</p>		
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			<p style="text-align: center;">Desert Vista School / Affiliation / Occupation</p>		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Thomas

- it can be fun to run a lot of arguments but having a large # of arguments comes w/ trade off of poor development your arguments are not put together well & wouldn't be hard to respond to
- you really should group in the summary rather than jumping all over the flow you also should set up relating mechanism
- even if you're not asking questions during grand try to at least look engaged / you're blankly staring out at a wall & its super distracting
- when making ext in sum try to make sure you hit the swarrants

Tomooka

- you should need more evidence in rebuttal, it's good you responded to everything but you should try to use more in addition to just logic
- then not having a fw isn't a reason that yours

Don't try to go down this road of coming up w/ a timeline for rahul castro coming out of power, just use the China argument

fw isn't a voting issue, you need to link to fw & then WEIGHT EVERYONE needs to watch their timers!

Chavez

- you need to practice reading through cases before you reach the tournament you need to be able to get through your case in time
- you need to be more confident, I know it can be hard but when you speak quietly w/ a lot of fluency breaks & ~~look~~ down extending of makes you seem really uncomfortable
- don't look @ your opponent during cf, look straight forward @ the judge
- you need to know the evidence in your case, you contradict your whole case in the summary

Nez

- you need to respond to your opponents case during your rebuttal, don't just reexplain your case
- don't give away first question in cf, that's the benefit of speaking first
- you need to look @ the judge during cf of your opponents

don't save 1:15 of prep for ff its totally unnecessary use the prep for rebuttal & summary you should only really only need max 15-30 seconds prep for ff

- you really should work on writing blocks & having more pre-tournament prep, not only will it make it easier to give speeches but it may help you be more confident


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.	

From the rebuttal, it's pretty clear that the aff is winning. when the neg doesn't respond to the aff at all & the aff goes down the neg w/ 2-4 responses per contention its just almost impossible for the neg to come back from that & they don't. The neg really has no offense or defense b/c they don't extend or respond to anything.



VPF

FLIP: 46 Vaughn - Gonzales v. 47 Bauman - Deaver

Varsity Public Forum			Mary-Jo Okawa (*37)		
Round 3			Room 880		Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Bauman	30	1st	Gonzales	25
2nd	Deaver	28	2nd	Vaughn	23
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature BASIS, Scottsdale/Teacher School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

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

• CON had good argument that Cuban missiles to North Korea is an act of supporting our enemies. However PRO's argument that trading with a country does not ~~implicate~~ equal agreement with their policies (ie. US and China) was a stronger argument.

• Vaughn - your volume is abrasive and strident! Way too loud. Your speed and volume did not help you in anyway.

• Bauman your pacing and articulations of your arguments were excellent.

• Gonzales your start was strong, but crossfires not as strong/confident.



• Deaver - you are more effective when not rushing.

• PRO - Unintended victims was a strong point.

• CON - assertion that Cuba committing acts of violence whenever embargo/restrictions lessen was not made clear.

VPF

FLIP: 37 Kukunoor - Amin v. 35 Sun - Zhang

Varsity Public Forum			Travis Clement (*30)		
Round 3			Room 422		Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Amin	29	1st	Sun	29
2nd	Kukunoor	30	2nd	Zhang	29
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>			 School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:


- ~~aff~~ <sup>aff</sup> wins because most impacts ~~aff~~ <sup>neg</sup> brought up played into ~~neg~~ <sup>aff</sup>'s "gradual reduction of barriers" argument
- ↳ neg conceded that recent reform is because of relaxed embargos and dropped Cuban energy contentions (2 and 3)
- aff successfully responded to almost if not everything neg said

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.	

Overall, one of the best rounds I've seen in a while.

CHRISTI, AAMIRATH VPF

FLIP: 57 Henden - Gordon v. 34 Cheng - Moriarty

Varsity Public Forum		Sidharth Kulkarni (*43)			
Round 3		Room 823	Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Cheng	29	1st	Gordon	29
2nd	Moriarty	29	2nd	Henden	29
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature BASIS Chandler School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Pro Con (Circle Winner)			Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro

- questionable source on literacy rates.
- Cheng, good job on being aggressive, Moriarty you need to speak up!
- ~~good on internet~~ good on internet contention.
- really good cards in summary, you should have brought it up earlier!
- I didn't see how embargo promotes human rights abuses and the Castro regime doesn't.
- good terrorism reputation.

Con

- excellent contention on tourism → racism.
- ~~really~~ good on impacts.
- good reputation for internet & corruption.
- Henden: good
- good on immediate v. gradual lift.
- still don't see how net lifting will help political prisoners/human rights.
- you should have had the UN & internet as a human right card, doesn't sound entirely accurate.


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.	

General

- anytime you mention any statistic, explain why it matters.
- Pro & Con both knew material well, nicely done & good speakers.
- don't bring up new evidence in FF or Summary !!

# VPF

FLIP: 35 Bawa - Kapadya v. 57 Gaidici - Kirkpatrick

Varsity Public Forum			Jana Segal (*20)		
Round 3			Room 402		Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Gaidic	22	1st	Kapadya	27
2nd	Kirkpatrick	23	2nd	Bawa	26
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Westview / Special Services School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <input type="checkbox"/>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro -  
 Gaidic - stop pacing  
 Kirkpatrick -  
 Speed up  
 address the humanitarian side i expand on how free trade will promote free flow of ideas

Good job

Con -  
 Both of you slow down  
 Pay more attention to the economic side i find evidence - specific to prove that lifting sanctions won't improve

Good job

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

**VPF**

FLIP: 35 Wang - Ramesh v. 37 Sidapara - Niu

<b>Varsity Public Forum</b>		<b>Kristin Andreatos (*9)</b>	
<b>Round 3</b>		<b>Room 403</b>	<b>Fri 02/10/17 06:30PM</b>
Speaker	<b>Pro - Lift Embargo</b>	Points (20-30)	Speaker
1st	<u>Niu</u>	<u>27</u>	1st <u>Wang</u>
2nd	<u>Sidapara</u>	<u>30</u>	2nd <u>Ramesh</u>
The winner of this debate was		<u>H. Clemens</u> Judge's Signature <u>99</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____			

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

II Neg Strong constructive. Thanks. IIA → Likewise.

\* Keep crossfire to Q&A vs speech time.

Hey aff - Be jeal friendly, please!

This was a fabulous & close round.

Con gets the Economics voter! → on FDI & loosening under embargo.  
 The FDI argument (Argentina) was more sophisticated, supported & articulated than an assertion of supply & demand. In CX con asked, "so how much FDI will Cuba get? Can you show its enough & ~~not~~ but so much as to overheat?" Aff couldn't answer. Aff asserts the flood can be absorbed, but w/no ev.  
 • Bsns liberalization - did happen under embargo. Con could have been stronger on this, but it is true. ~~B~~ Smbns growth w/o FDI impact.

HR argument. I'm prone towards the Aff arguments, but find it to be a wash. Scapegoating I buy as non-unique to embargo - esp. if FDI & overheating happen. While I hate '23/9 & justification for harsh legislation by Castro - The economic instability of FDI creates worse. Further, loosening in HR abuses occurs grad. under embargo - a looser embargo, still an embargo.

Great analysis of evidence Both sides. Thanks for competing @ a HIGH level.

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.	