This was a very close debate but I think CON wins because PRO conflated checks vs. deterrence and because CON brought through one check, the congressional oversight/power of the purse. PRO very nearly won and would have had two things happened: first, finish removing congressional oversight like you took out watchdog, Public Opinion and Judicial Review. Also, I didn’t see good linkages in your construction to the AUMF being the unique reason that drones are used. The Presidential experience point did not make sense to me; none of the 3 presidents since 9/11 have foreign policy background. Also, you should have just kept pressing the 14 countries point. Al-shabab was refuted so choose Boko Haram or someone else.
# Public Forum Debate

## FLIP: 8 Pattipati - Zhou v. 5 Shih - Guan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter-Finals</th>
<th>George Justice (*'12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Zhou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Pattipati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Guan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **No**

---

**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.

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Zhou: clear analysis and speaking
- Pattipati: good summary
- Guan: strong in cross
**Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter-Finals</th>
<th>Xavier Henes ('14)</th>
<th>LL271</th>
<th>Sat 03/10/18 12:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Gustin</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gill</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro** (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **Yes**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

All four participants did a very nice job.

RFD: Neg/Con team successfully rebutted the Aff team's so-called "second observation" about the Kaine-Flake proposal as likely irrelevant to their case. Simultaneously, as the case came down to whether current checks are sufficient or straw, Neg/Con successfully demonstrated the former in this debate (even though I am personally partial to the Aff perspective).

Crossfire exchanges were a touch rude, primarily because both sides seemed impatient with the other.

**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.
Both sides very good contentions

Neg side went after majority of points well but left open two points about destabilization after US enters country and creation of mercenary warfare. Additionally Aff made good points about SOFA not being relevant as often youth in those countries are unstable.

Very close!