


VPF

FLIP: 34 Cheng - Moriarty v. 51 Yague - Dunlop

Varsity Public Forum			Jeff Gordon (*57)		
Round 4			Room 839		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Cheng	27	1st	Yague	26
2nd	Moriarty	28	2nd	Dunlop	28
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Westview / Special Services School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Pro Con (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Good points excellent job ladies Cheng - slow down Dunlop - speed up & face forward keep questions go ahead

I checked w/ tournament officials ~~that~~ and new arguments can be brought in until Final Focus Con was in order to bring in last couple of 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.	

It is only in constructed debates. ~~don't allow~~ new arguments ~~after opening arguments~~ aren't allowed ~~after~~ in rebuttal

Great points  
+ counter points

VPF

FLIP: 50 Alam - Corrigan v. 58 Chavez - Nez

Varsity Public Forum			Erin Guiney (*34)		
Round 4			Room 863		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Alam	29	1st	Chavez	27
2nd	Corrigan	29	2nd	Nez	26
The winner of this debate was			Erin Guiney Judge's Signature		
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner)			Tempe Prep School / Affiliation / Occupation		
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.	

save \$ + make \$ by listings

CON

burden: → prove democracy ↑ boofembargo ✓

1) democratization  
 - HRV respected by diplomatic convo, not embargo  
 - embargo ≠ change regime or for. investments (≠ meet goal)

2) econ benefits  
 - us loses \$ thru exports  
 - ↑ jobs, etc.  
 - ↓ smuggling, etc.

1) HRV  
 → sanctions = HRV  
 2) benefits to few  
 - govt owned by Castro  
 - will use \$ to strengthen military → reform from Peru  
 3) cuban debt rise  
 - still owe \$26B to other countries (Russia, etc.)



con's work on structure in speeches and flow all your arguments through! make sure the summary isn't just restating your case.

pro: great burden! need KVs to be related to clash, not necessarily just your case.

Castro uses stolen \$ used to trade w/ other countries

COHEN, JOHN (30)

2<sup>nd</sup> CON VPF  
FLIP: 16 Raju - Goswick v 49 Jasso - Kief

Varsity Public Forum			Sabrina Porter (*55)		
Round 4			Room 862		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Kief (1)	27	1st	Goswick (2)	27
2nd	Jasso (3)	27.5	2nd	Raju (4)	27
			(54.5)		
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:

① Very good presentation with good points made. You seemed like you had made the speech too many times. Suggest you slow down a little bit and make it sound fresh.

② Also very good - well done.

③ Good refutation in general, especially the point about "keeping the pressure on."

④ Good presentation

[to 4 - what is purpose of embargo? -  
A. political A will Pro follow up?

① - Good explanation of possible economic change in Cuba

② -

Pro -

- counterproductive - not effective
- medical equip ↓
- medical care
- more trade could lead to improved political i.e. China
- could produce a new relationship
- benefit to US citizens

Con

- The regime will capture the benefit
- Population still suffers - like slave labor
- Keep the leverage on - don't give it.

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:

Great debate and a very close call because all four of you are good at this. On balance, PRO had a slight edge when all was said and done.


~~LADICK, BENJAMIN~~

Bobcat Bonanza 2017

GARRARD, YESHI (1)

VPF


FLIP: 35 Kandan - Gupta v. 3 Strauch - Sanchez-Lonnie - Pro

Varsity Public Forum		Benjamin Ladick (*47)			
Round 4		Room 825	Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Sanchez-Lonnie</u>	<u>25</u>	1st	<u>Gupta</u>	<u>27</u>
2nd	<u>Strauch</u>	<u>26</u>	2nd	<u>Kandan</u>	<u>27</u>
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature <u>1/ Volunteer / Program Manager</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Con</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

oral feedback given

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			Shannon Giovannoli (*51)		
Round 4			Room 876		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Amy Zhou	26	1st	Gina Sun	21
2nd	Thomas Chung	24	2nd	Grace Zhang	28
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)			Catherine Foothills High School School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:


Gina → You made excellent points and supported them well all except for the last one. You kind of lost me on that one. Good question on Obama already allowing trade. You were stronger on cross. Good for you for asking for proof when they couldn't provide. You were a little too intense with your summary. Slow down, calm down, you'll be more effective.

Amy → You might have spent too long on contention one. Good response to first cross question. You ~~waited into the argument about the embargo~~. You struggled a little on cross. ~~There~~ You kind of got cornered on the Obama's no longer in office comment.

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.	

Grace → If the Pro can't prove lifting right now then judge should vote con Great point! Gas on dying a fire is a strong analogy. You have good arguments, but you're reading and not speaking to me. New leader will be judged on economic performance was a great point. You're talking way too fast. You were better on cross than you were on your presentation. Great summary especially about 90% of infused going to military. Changing President! does it mean changing policies.

Thomas → I'm not following your first point regarding their first contention. They're likely to change their regime. just bc we lift the embargo, I don't agree with that. Flooding Cuba w/ American \$ was a good argument that does contradict one of their points. You kind of supported their argument about overheating the economy. Immersing \$ is coin doesn't necessarily eliminate a repressive regime.

Varsity Public Forum		Dillon Butler (#13)		Jaclyn Stack (35)	
Round 4		Room 880		Fri 02/10/17 07:45 PM	
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Neuner	28	1st	Thomas	28
2nd	Neuner	28	2nd	Tomooka	29
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:

The pro side in this round argued that the U.S. should lift the embargo because under the embargo, Cubans are not receiving medical or quality food and water, resulting in poor quality of life. The con had evidence refuted this claim, informing the pro side that the U.S. has been funding in medical and nutritional assistance for years. The pro side claims that lifting the embargo would pave the way for Cuba to become more democratic. Furthermore, the U.S. has an obligation to lift the embargo under international law. However, the con countered that with a legal obligation is void, the embargo isn't. Cuba released political prisoners. The con also pointed out that the pro side has no evidence that Cuba will become more democratic if the embargo was lifted. The pro's biggest claim was superceded their case is that the embargo violates human rights. The con effectively argued that the embargo is not violating human rights (because embargoes are against Cuban govts, not Cubans) but the embargo violates human rights since if Cuba had to do to restore human rights to political prisoners in order to lift the embargo, the con effectively took down the pro's framework, and that's where con.

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

VPF

FLIP: 38 Parau - Kim v. 5 Cardone - Rusk

Varsity Public Forum			Mary-Jo Okawa (*37)		
Round 4			Room 875		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Cardone	28	1st	Kim	26
2nd	Rusk	27	2nd	Parau	30
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature BASIS Scottsdale / Teacher School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? _____					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Both teams were exemplary in their prep and delivery as well as cross.
- PRO made an excellent case for sharing of medical knowledge and research. However, CON was convincing with their argument that professionals of all types may flee/migrate to the U.S. if embargo is lifted.
- CON'S point that government was unharmed by embargo and that PRO's assertion that money would find its way to the people was weak.
- CON'S point that aid is already provided and that although Cuba is only limited on trade with U.S. was a strong argument against. In addition, CON seemed to prove

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. 57 Gaidici - Kirkpatrick

Varsity Public Forum			Corrine Carlton (*16)		
Round 4			Room 869		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	J. Cohen	29	1st	Gaidici	27
2nd	S. Cohen	30	2nd	Kirkpatrick	28
The winner of this debate was					
<p><b>Pro</b> Con (Circle Winner)</p>			<p><u>Corrine Carlton</u> Judge's Signature</p>		
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			<p><u>Desert Vista</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation</p>		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

S. Cohen  
 - you don't really have a good link btwn trading partner & Cuban democracy is super sketchy/non-existent in the case & the way you explain it in cf makes it worse, there's no world where Cuba wants to condemn HR abuses  
 - dang like that off the road map was loong, try to just maybe say what your key voters are  
 - you need to start weighing in summary  
 - try to actually group issues  
 - if you're going to distinguish btwn econ/pol leverage you need to actually utilize this distinction

Gaidici

- you shift your weight around alot when you speak, try to stand still  
 - don't leave your timer somewhere where you have to reach to grab it & put it down every 30 seconds  
 - look @ the judge during cf or at least look Gaidici & at your opponents  
 - it can be a hard skill to learn but you need to ask questions during cf & rely on your partner  
 - need to cover more in summary  
 - you spend way too much time repeating their contention & then the entire time on their CI w/out extending anything from your own case

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
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.	

Kirkpatrick

- it's great that you know the evidence you're reading in rebuttal but may want to consider reading cards word for word  
 - make sure you get good examples of reasons Castro might not be willing to negotiate, look @ North Korea  
 - don't admit that embargo forces to go to China & Russia  
 - don't end your 2 minute speech w/ 15 seconds left

S. Cohen  
 - make sure you use cf for questions  
 - ↑ revenue from Tourism & income inequality

Unfortunately, based on the neg summary where everything was dropped except off CI which left neg in a tight spot. The aff is extending a lot of impacts outside of the Russia-China argument which makes it easy to vote aff. Based on US benefits which is part of neg fw I can even just vote on \$1 → \$1.27 USDA card, even if I don't make a decision about China.



FLIP: 20 Labenz - Wallace v. 57 Henden - Gordon

(1) = PRO <sup>prep</sup>  
(2) = CON <sup>my prep turn</sup>  
V.P.F. <sup>will</sup>

Varsity Public Forum			Leah Veschio (*11)		
Round 4			Room 881		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Wallace	27	1st	Gordon	28
2nd	Labenz	28	2nd	Henden	29
The winner of this debate was			Leah Veschio		
Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner)			Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			Basis Ptg / MSW		
Comments & Reason for Decision:			School/Affiliation/Occupation		

PRO (Wallace) - Good opening statement.  
 Good arguments supporting PRO  
 ~ I heard different arguments from Wallace than I did from any of rounds  
 ~ excellent references/sources

Gordon (Con) ~ said to U.S. <sup>Poor</sup> economic result for U.S.  
 - Good presentation, organized way to follow

Con took CF

Labenz ~ improve relationships. ~ excellent topics

Henden - strong statistics the counter argu  
Pro Points - well done.

1st cont. of Con - is a very strong argument  
I did not see Pro arg. this point  
Pulled it together @ the end


Grand finale = Both teams did a great job = +  
over

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 11/17/17

VPF

FLIP: 35 Bawa - Kapadya v. 17 Jiang - Frazey

Varsity Public Forum			Ryan Robinson (*32)		
Round 4			Room 835		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Frazey	24	1st	Kapadya	27
2nd	Jiang	30	2nd	Bawa	20
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Schuylers HS / Teacher. School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) <b>Pro</b> Con Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Speaker 4 Good Analysis on the Dueserov.  
 of con case & aggressive Arguments

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 - AS Per my Derivation the Pro collapsed the arguments at the end of the Round to internet they need a stronger case that internet leads to

Democratization & Share the gov.  
 lacks the ability to censor. It wasn't specific link  
 the con case did not work except in broad terms  
 I also bought Pro arguments on con Dueserov  
 that I thought con did not explain well enough  
 why it was in fact not contributing. Particulars  
 in terms of aggression.

grossman  
 wd.

VPF


FLIP: 53 Ly - Armenta v. 20 Wicklund - Gaudet

Varsity Public Forum			Scott Sammons (*3)		
Round 4			Room 833		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Ly	27	1st	Gaudet	29
2nd	Armenta	25	2nd	Wicklund	28
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Tolleson Union 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: (more 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
10 minutes of Prep Time per side	
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.	

- A key aspect of the Pro team's argument was that the ending of the embargo would increase food security through trade. This was never adequately supported with evidence and was also effectively countered.
- An important moment in the debate occurred when the Con team's 2nd speaker asked, "Why would the U.S. be more of an influence for democracy in Cuba when the trade relationship with China doesn't indicate this?" (or something to that extent). This was ineffectively dodged by the Pro team.
- As the Con team points out, the Pro team never thoroughly supports the notion that lifting the embargo will increase democracy in Cuba.
- The Pro team's speaker #2's Final Focus and 1st speech lacked organization and flow.
- Both teams were thoroughly researched and prepared.

Varsity Public Forum			Sidharth Kulkarni (*43)		
Round 4			Room 402		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Knorr	29	1st	Elsbecker	29
2nd	Flores	29	2nd	Schaefer	29
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
(Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			BASIS Chandler School / Affiliation / Occupation		

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
- good disaster relief & economy contention
  - ~~retracted~~ good GDP stats
  - & military spending/war/probability of war.
  - mention of human rights
  - you missed the chance to refute this or use this to your advantage
  - favor of Pro observations, includes human rights & economy along with national security.
  - good on creation of jobs ~~but~~ (your mistake is forgive) & GDP growth.
  - great final focus.

- Con
- reputation: lack of members, US doesn't need help
  - weapons goes to
  - you need to talk more about human rights, not just what you have in your observation (less national security)
  - good with examples on healthcare costs.
  - but this needs to lead back to why it shouldn't be lifted, it sounds like if there is a small lift, completely lifting the embargo would really benefit healthcare.
  - did not refute ~~embargo~~


Unusual

- good cx for pro & con & speeches in general.
- NUCLEAR WARFARE IS FOR POLICY

Con  
 Pro  
 1:01.

# VPF

FLIP: 16 Wakefield - Gustin v. 43 Wang - Samin

Varsity Public Forum			Clayton Guy (*58)		
Round 4			Room 879		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Wang	27	1st	Gustin	28
2nd	Samin	28	2nd	Wakefield	28
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Aradia HS 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:

Wang - 2 good contentions. Strong, clear well thought argument. Samin not clear in parts - finished strong - did attack each contention. Wang on 3 key voters make sure to have time for each. Samin gave strong

Gustin - good speech, 2 strong contentions - leverage was weakest. Wakefield - good attacking each contention. Good overall job


Con did a good job contesting human influence on human rights argument & how embargo not done a problem. Pro did not give enough to justify after embargo. Good debate

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.	

SINGHA, KSMITILZ (16)

VPF

FLIP: 46 Shah - Kalra v. 38 Potter - Yakoob

Varsity Public Forum			Travis Clement (*30)		
Round 4			Room 401		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Potter	28	1st	Shah	29
2nd	Yakoob	28	2nd	Kalra	30
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Desert Vista School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <b>Con</b> (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro

- I want some discourse on how effective sanctions are as a whole
- Not really sure what the "blockade" rhetoric adds to your case.
- You need savings for the diplomacy arg- things if you concede that Cuba is setting better than you are b/c no impacts
- Conceding that the Cuban pol like democracy
- The U.S. economic impact is pretty much negligible, esp. b/c I don't see any quantification on your impacts
- What you don't contest is the fact that it's the best time in 50 years: in general you may be right b/c not in this case, is their argument.
- Conceding that the pol of Cuba like the U.S. drop your point about separability

Con


- Ask them why climate change funds aren't going there anyway
- I don't think you handle the economic blame arg - correctly: at least in one response
- Neither of y'all are doing a good job of warranting your frameworks
- ~~What~~
- Military arg is good - Resale, the Cuban economic benefits
- Econ arguments on both sides are muddy

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 Capin - Stebner v. 50 Tefft - Schuerman

Varsity Public Forum			Jennifer Rhue (*5)		
Round 4		Room 837	Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Capin	25	1st	Tefft	28
2nd	Stebner	28	2nd	Schuerman	21
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature MHS 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:

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 maintain your cool. watch your time.

good job controlling CX

Capin (3:57)  
(2:10)  
Confident Speaker  
Stumbled over words  
love the bowtie!  
fantastic eye contact  
great deliver  
good speed  
easy to understand  
maintain civility  
good job controlling cross

Tefft (4:03)  
(1:50)  
confident speaker  
know how to say key words  
good use of eye contact  
very well spoken  
stumbled over words  
don't allow yourself to get flustered in CX  
second speech was a little shaky (ummm)

Stebner (4:17)  
(2:10)  
Confident speaker  
fantastic eye contact  
Stumbled over words  
you have a good amount of knowledge about topic  
keep track of time  
do not talk while opponents are giving speech


Schuerman (4:02)  
(2:00)  
thank you for the heads up  
that you fight fire w/fire  
you speak a little fast, but you can be understood  
fantastic eye contact  
you have a vast amount of knowledge on topic  
stumbled a bit at end  
sarcasm is not needed  
don't let yourself get flustered

	Pro	Con
	47 sec	30 sec
		52 sec
		82

please turn over  
give evidence when asked for

VPF

FLIP: 53 Rosal - Vaillancourt v. 16 Xie - Gill

Varsity Public Forum			Brendan Scobie (*20)		
Round 4			Room 421		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Xie	26	1st	Vaillancourt	27
2nd	Gill	27	2nd	Rosal	29
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature McNamee High School School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>yes</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Will promote democracy
- ~~Not~~ Major human rights violations will improve labor economy
- Known excuse for human rights abuse
- Didn't offer ~~framework~~ framework

- Affly would make U.S. appear weak
- Not met their requirements to lift embargo

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.	

- Then what DOES U.S. stand for? More evidence is

- Don't look at your opponent so much
- Good attack on second contention

- Good rebuttal to whether embargo has helped


- Talking about the future in this way is irrelevant - the topic is meant to be concerning the current situation
- Good attack - Korea was irrelevant
- Great point about allyship with our enemies

- Rosal - nice suit man
- Excellent speaking skills
- You are not relating your point here
- This debate is not discussing what the embargo might turn into
- IF the UNICEF Act is actually true - excellent point. I can't look it up so I will assume it is correct



(R) VPF (L)

FLIP: 16 Fiber - Lane v. 37 Kukunoor - Amin

Varsity Public Forum			Danny Deniger (*19)		
Round 4			Room 827		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Lane	27	1st	Amin	27
2nd	Fiber	26	2nd	Kukunoor	28
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
Pro (Con) (Circle Winner)			Shadow Mtn School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Is this a low point win? NO					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PRO

Summary - Not enough time spent on your case... why?

- Ⓢ Please give con some CX questions...
- Ⓢ Strong impromptu argumentation



This happened then you claimed I should drop the whole con case?  
 Not happening buddy

CON

Ⓢ Constructive: Like the case format. Easy to follow and frames the arguments.

Ⓢ The ethanol argument seems pretty bad, weak uniqueness means weak impacts

Ⓢ I think your defense of "non-topical" for C2 was valid but I wish you spent more time there

Ⓢ You definitely dropped tourism, don't waste time calling it a voter


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 con because the impacts from political instability were more numerous and well defined than the loss of soft power.

# VPF

FLIP: 58 Wieck - Razor v. 13 Chen - Reddie

Varsity Public Forum		Vismay Pandia (*25)			
Round 4		Room 868		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Reddie	29	1st	Wieck	25
2nd	Chen	29	2nd	Razor	26
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Desert Mountain School School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Pro) Con (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____					

1-30

4810

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Voted on until the PW that was completely dropped

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.	



until good  
turns are good

FW  
30,000 resisters → need pointers  
resisting  
Argue why (1870) embargo → less political resistance

BROWN, T (46)

# VPF

FLIP: 32 Carr - Hughes v. 38 Taylor - Mance

Varsity Public Forum		Rachel Fromm (*40)			
Round 4		Room 882	Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Hughes	27	1st	Mance	27
2nd	Carr	28	2nd	Taylor	26
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? <u>nope</u>			 School / Affiliation / Occupation		


Comments & Reason for Decision:

- aff impacts beat neg impacts and I buy aff key voters more
- neg used very little evidence and didn't extend
- both teams need more organization in rebuttals and summary

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

# VPF

FLIP: 9 Nguyen - Schulman v. 35 Jung - Long

Varsity Public Forum		Xavier Henes (*28)			
Round 4		Room 870	Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Nguyen	30	1st	Jung	28
2nd	Schulman	26	2nd	Long	29
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <input type="checkbox"/> No			Honyos 28 School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: The affirmative would have won the round had they talked about a reason that people were joining the private sector i.e. people want to become entrepreneurs. Secondly they needed to talk about how overheating would be dealt w/.

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.	



~~DISIMONE, LUKE~~

Bobcat Bonanza 2017

WEIDERT, ZACK (\*46)

VPF

FLIP: 16 Aberg - Braun v. 37 Vijayakumar - Samant

Varsity Public Forum		Luke DiSimone (*46)					
Round 4		Room 823	Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM				
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Vijayakumar	Con	Points (20-30)	
1st	<del>Braun</del> Braun	29	1st	<del>Vijayakumar</del> Vijayakumar		28	
2nd	<del>Aberg</del> Aberg	28	2nd	<del>Samant</del> Samant		29	
The winner of this debate was				<p style="text-align: center;">             Judge's Signature         </p> <p style="text-align: center;">             School / Affiliation / Occupation         </p>			
Pro		Con					
(Circle Winner)		I believe they won					
Is this a low point win? _____							

60 sec  
15 sec

Comments & Reason for Decision:

P - loss of latin america support with embargo, less soft power

- less leverage globally
- China gaining leverage
- threatens national security (N)
- strengthen private sector
- force gov't to adjust domestic policy
- tourism already present (?)
- latin america supports Cuba
- foreign investment will increase influence for U.S.

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 -
- influence arms trade
  - influence change in gov't
  - decrease in human rights
  - applies leverage on Cuba
  - increase oppression towards Cubans
  - increase racial tensions
  - soft power irrelevant, already low
  - Cuba different from other latin America countries
  - Gov't control 95% of their economy
  - Embargo promotes liberation
  - Trump unwilling to lift embargo
  - in-state will liberalize economy, not out-of-state

VPF

FLIP: 55 Takhar - Tam v. 47 Bauman - Deaver

Varsity Public Forum			Bethlehem Ayalew (*26)		
Round 4			Room 832		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Takhar	27	1st	Bauman	29
2nd	Tam	21	2nd	Deaver	29
The winner of this debate was			Bethlehem Ayalew Judge's Signature ACP - Eric 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.	

Takhar

- + Great pace in intro - clear + well put points
- + Well prepared
- + Speaks with determination
- + Good questions / rebuttal
- Repeating what is already stated isn't reinforcing pts.

Bauman

- + Great pace, well put points
- + Great questions to reinforce pts.
- + Speaks well
- + Great rebuttal

Tam

- Hurried to state points + loses re. enforcement.
- + Good follow-up questions
- + Great in putting points together

Deaver

- + Speaks w/ confidence
- + methodical train of thought to explain why/reinforce pts.
- + Good call on fact + reinforcement
- + Good eye contact
- + Great common sense to rationalize

# VPF

FLIP: 46 Vaughn - Gonzales v. 16 DeLashmutt - Bencomo

Varsity Public Forum		Chris Lee (*35)			
Round 4		Room 422	Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM		
Speaker	Pro <u>2</u>	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con <u>1</u>	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Bencomo</u>	<u>25</u>	1st	<u>Gonzales</u>	<u>25</u>
2nd	<u>DeLashmutt</u>	<u>24</u>	2nd	<u>Vaughn</u>	<u>25</u>
The winner of this debate was			_____ Judge's Signature		
Pro    Con (Circle Winner)			_____ School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*Pro - better articulation  
 and did well  
 Con - good prep work  
 show*


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.	

*42  
 50  
 10*

*45  
 36  
 50  
 100*

VPF

FLIP: 20 Ackerley - Chen v. 46 Ramos - Gopal

Varsity Public Forum			Peter Kolshorn (*53)		
Round 4			Room 836		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Chen	27	1st	Gopal	29
2nd	Ackerley	27	2nd	Ramos	28
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Bonita Vista M.S. School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)			Is this a low point win? <u>N</u>		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFID: I chose for the NEG. -- they painted somewhat of a doomsday scenario but were able to back much of it up with their arguments + sources. Also spent AFF on issue of medical supplies as they had a more updated vid. AFF made a big emphasis on Russia but NEG made a good point that relations are shifting. AFF wasn't influential enough on argument of the effect of Anti-American sentiment in Latin America.

Chen - Good speaker. Clear eye contact. Especially in summary.  
 Ackerley - Good debate techniques "you yourself said..." just didn't have enough ~~influential~~ influential info.

GOPAL - Very strong + informed well researched. Sometimes voice inflection + cadence increases.

Ramos - Good solid poised speaker. Once or twice contradicted partner like on military spending...


\* ALL - Bolivia, Venezuela, Uruguay, Paraguay - NOT Communist! (some socialist)  but good job!

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: 53 Casey - Jazo v. 55 Tehranchi - Afework

Varsity Public Forum			Scott Schuerman (*50)		
Round 4 <del>53</del>			Room 865 <del>53</del>		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	JAZO	28	1st	TEHRANCHI	26
2nd	CASEY	29	2nd	AFEWORK	27
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature GCA / Systems Analyst School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con <input type="radio"/> Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:


- (EVEN)** SP1 TEHRANCHI - Acceptable framework, easy to understand, SP2 JAZO - DITTO Appropriate use of facts and sources
- (PRO)** CROSS 1/2 - PRO challenged CON and CON dodged the questions or unable to respond.
- (EVEN)** SP3 AFEWORK - Provided numerous facts although some of the claims were not convincing.
- SP4 CASEY - Good point-by-point challenge to CON's case.
- (PRO)** CROSS 3/4 - PRO's arguments are stronger and CON is not convincing. CON: "Cuba doesn't need humanitarian aid." - Really? I'm not convinced.
- SP1 TEHRANCHI - SUMMARY - "Money will just go to the govt if the embargo is lifted." - Not convincing - NO FACTS TO BACK UP THIS STATEMENT.
- SP2 JAZO summary - Presented specific FACTS to bolster PRO's case.
- (EVEN)** ~~Clearly identified facts one-by-one.~~ GRANDCROSS - Good participation on both sides. No advantage to either side.
- (EVEN)** SP3 FF AFEWORK - Fair wrap up, good points made.
- SP4 FF CASEY - DITTO

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

RFD: PRO was better prepared, more convincing, and provided facts to back up their claims. CON ~~did~~ dodged questions and lacked facts to back up claims. See underlined items above. PRO also had better speakers than CON. No speaker points were removed for speakers that were tired or ill on either side.

# VPF

FLIP: 20 Liaupsin - Little v. 37 Sidapara - Niu

Varsity Public Forum			Sherry Meng (*17)		
Round 4			Room 860		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Liaupsin	28	1st	Niu	29
2nd	Little	28	2nd	Sidapara	30
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Corona del Sol, parent 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:

It was a great round. Con had a couple of points went through nicely. One example is turning the argument of more human rights violation after 2010 ish by crediting it to laxing travel ban by Obama. Con also articulated a little better.

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 Wang - Ramesh v. 30 Khan - Patel

Varsity Public Forum			Hina Fazal (*38)		
Round 4			Room 878		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Khan</u>	<u>26</u>	1st	<u>Wang</u>	<u>27</u>
2nd	<u>Patel</u>	<u>26</u>	2nd	<u>Ramesh</u>	<u>27</u>
The winner of this debate was			_____ Judge's Signature <u>Basis Perera</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)			Is this a low point win? _____		

21.  
37.

20 sec  
30 sec  
25.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Sp-1 economic loss. 3.6 billion. agriculture. can become agriculture export market for US. Export can be 3rd party ag. US. lower shipping cost. job creation. 6000 new jobs. increase in trade. use US as escape. Cuba regime is a p

SP 1. Increase in FDI by 17 billion. over heating economy. major challenge. too much trade. political instability. fuel state. Impact lead to terrorism. devalue the wage. Govt own 90%. Human right abuses. Harassment. embargo imp. to human rights forced cuba -ve ballot.

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.	

Stimulate trade.


foreign companies would invest in cuba. It's not good ppl would be effected

sp2. before embargo we were no 1 trade. Same trade relation uplifting their economy. Helping cuban as well as US economy. We can have influence on cuba by lifting embargo.

sp2 When you increase trade economy is not ready. Embargos are not getting benefits. Money is going to govt. 6000 jobs going through govt. not helping cuban people. Human right abuses.

VPF

FLIP: 41 Joseph - Delgado v. 13 Venkatachalam - Showers

Varsity Public Forum		Amber Root (*49)			
Round 4		Room 866	Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Showers	25	1st	Delgado	27
2nd	Venkatachalam	26	2nd	Joseph	28
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature NPP School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input type="radio"/> <b>Con</b> <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? _____					

57-  
1.03

32

31

1.07

56

21

Comments & Reason for Decision:

obs. how Embargo has been beneficial

c1- beneficial to economy

c2- Healthcare

Lol've seen this run all 4 rounds  
 Lol hasn't gone through once

Try to ask more analytical questions - Not just expansions on contentions

• Make sure to have taglines  
 Start of your speech read as new contentions

c2 Medicine & Technology

c3 promotion of Democracy


• ~~the~~ what is the link b/w Cuban Embargo and taxpayers covering debt

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.	

Really good, close round  
 \* Neg had better command/presence + held case better\*

VPF

FLIP: 40 Ball - Rolfness v. 46 Cardellini - Coben

Varsity Public Forum			Kristin Andreatos (*9)		
Round 4			Room 403		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Coben	29	1st	Rolfness	27
2nd	Cardellini	29	2nd	Ball	28
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Chaparral / teacher School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con					
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

R: - be ready for comparison to other communist nations w/ no embargo  
 - stronger during summary

B - could create better flow in initial speech (organization)  
 - could be more assertive on cross  
 - strong pt -> "should" points to utilitarian rather than U.S. benefits

\* 1st & 3rd contention need more supportive data

\* strongest pt - uncertainty (Cuba gov, U.S. gov, migration policy)

Co: - good speaking ~~voice~~  
 - strong on cross  
 - well structured & easy to follow contentions  
 - don't wait until summary to add internet evidence

\* how many times are installed democracies successful?

Ca: - strong pt -> sanctions ↑ violations  
 - strong performance on cross -> remove pressure to allow grassroots change, normalization  
 - good pt on grand cross -> 40% work for private -> ↑ \$ -> ↑ indep

\* strongest pt - democracy (change narrative, credibility)

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.	