**Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Tristan Brown (*'12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Steiner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **(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.
AUMF

Power of the purse
2) Congress doesn't feel checks & balances out of which

Pro
D) Drone strikes
   - arms race
   - ?
   - Terrorist attacks

a) Propetural war
Kanan - Social Openings

Careful to outline your pro arguments on social openings - especially with the resolution you're outlining. Think about your main points, cross them off, and outline them well. Good job in outlining your pro arguments! Consider the resolution carefully and present your main points clearly.

As for your con arguments on social openings, you mentioned the "Great American Dream" and how Trump campaigned against it. However, I think it's important to consider the perspective of the opposing arguments. You could expand on this by mentioning specific policies or actions of the Trump administration that are relevant to the resolution.

To summarize, your pro arguments on social openings are well-organized and clear, while your con arguments could benefit from more specific examples or elaboration. Keep working on framing your arguments and outlining their pros and cons.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Wayne Frank (*2)</th>
<th>Fri 03/09/18 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Xi2</td>
<td>Frazey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>Jiang</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

(Locate Winner)

Is this a low point win?

(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.
I vote Con on the basis of framework. There was much clash, but I value the Con's framework of checks and balances over the Pro's framework over lives. I agreed with the Con's rationale that "too much power" must be comparable to something else—namely other branches of government. The Con showed that other branches of government do have some power to limit the President's AVNF, and their arguments were well-constructed. The Pro side took a consequentialism cause which is nonunique, kill and save people. The Pro did try to make a case that Congress is bought by lobbyists to not check the President's AVNF, but this claim has no evidence behind it to support the idea that Congress has no autonomy.
Both teams presented well. I give the win to the neg. team because I feel like they were more consistent with their arguments! The pro team could have been more specific with examples for their alternate proposal to NDMF.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Pro: Peijavar</th>
<th>Con: Mukherjee</th>
<th>Con: Pro</th>
<th>Con: Gustin</th>
<th>Con: Celli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Peijavar</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Gustin</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Mukherjee</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Celli</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**.

**Pro**

**Con**

(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:**

- Checks and Balances - Press - Exposure
- People - Public Opinion
- Judicial Review
- Congressional Authority
- (Drone strikes saves vs lives)?
- Broadness necessary!
- (Congress failing to act? Funding? Does kill civilians?)
- (Entrenchment, Timeframe already involved)
- (Great references)

**Summary Stage**

- Using Aum E Beyond Good and humane use
- Huts WW2 view of USA
- New Proposal? (Congress doesn't have enough power)
- Great president
- (Congress doesn't have enough power)
- Great
- (Congress needs an accessible)

**PF**

---

**Reasons forWin on the Back**

**Good President / Bad President?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1: Sengupta</th>
<th>2: Frank</th>
<th>3: Hepworth</th>
<th>4: Delgado</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Checks &amp; balances provides solvency</td>
<td>- Congress passed AUMF into law</td>
<td>- Command &amp; Congressional oversight</td>
<td>- Provides checks &amp; balances that solves democratic tyranny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/Benefit</td>
<td>1) Fight against terrorism</td>
<td>2) Swift actions against terrorism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dec. war cost anomalies, approval of AUMF (al-Qaeda)</td>
<td>2) Time/Space to strike</td>
<td>3) Swift actions against terrorism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Allies</td>
<td>3) Swift actions against terrorism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enlist Support of int. nat. comm.</td>
<td>4) Congress passed AUMF into law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Checks &amp; Balances</td>
<td>- Countries want to combat terrorism</td>
<td>- Alliances important &amp; will have &quot;sufficient&quot; power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 9/11</td>
<td>- Lots of funding</td>
<td>- Phasing of debate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Obama applied AUMF against ISIS (House of Rep. call invasions illegal)</td>
<td>- Have to want our own standards for combating terrorism by&quot;democratic&quot;tyranny</td>
<td>- Not signing repeal nce. sustainable or not its too much power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prevents democratic tyranny</td>
<td>- Reiteration of &quot;final&quot; talk in points</td>
<td>- Not so much a response to this debate as a prepped construct, House debate was likely to go.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Congress will act without</td>
<td>- Congress &amp; judicial branch have ability to check</td>
<td>Congress is bankrupt in an abuse of power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time to strike</td>
<td>- Power on Cross-X 4 (43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Better foreign policy</td>
<td>2 (68)</td>
<td>2 (68)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it give the much Mil. forces time to strike</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The current authorization of military force gives Pres. too much power.

Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Tyler Rife ('17)</th>
<th>Fri 03/09/18 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Speaker Con Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sengupta 29</td>
<td>1st Frank 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Hepworth 27</td>
<td>2nd Delgado 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro (Circle Winner) No

For 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: 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:

- As I mentioned in my disclosure, keep working to discuss how the democratic system functions, than how it should be. This may help ground the argument and provide current examples of abuses of power, complicity, groupthink, how reps have called the AUMF an abuse of power, etc.

- Draw out the logic through a narrative of "okay, so what happens next?" as opposed to circling around broader assumptions.

- Great work overall!
### Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Russell Gould (*10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>ABERG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>BRAUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>KAPADYA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>BAWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**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.
On balance, the current administration for use of military force goes to much greater to the President, not to the Congress. A counter-force act in self-defense.

- Military intervention in Iran (1980).
- Non-commissioned officers promote.
The Negative failed to rebuttle any of the New Information given after the 2nd speech. The only thing flowed through the Negative’s favor was the travel ban based upon Trump’s ideology. The Affirmative gave ample rebuttles to both Contentions.
AFF

Judge: Your case needs to be centered on the AUMF: is it really necessary? It's not really a question of a ‘general’ AUMF but a specific policy. The AUMF isn't the issue here. We need to summarize your whole case, not just one point. Your case summary is not clear. You need to summarize your whole case in your first statement. Complete your statement. We'll do what we can to help you.

ProCon

Yes, it seems there was some confusion about the AUMF. It isn't clear about the current policy, which we need to address. We'll do what we can to help you. Your case summary is not clear. You need to summarize your whole case in your first statement. Complete your statement. We'll do what we can to help you.

Round 1

Speaker 1

Speaker 2

Order/Time Limits

2 minutes of Prep Time per side
2 minutes of Prep Time per side
Speaker 1: Final Focus: 2 min
Speaker 2: Final Focus: 2 min
Speaker 1: Final Focus: 3 min
Speaker 2: Final Focus: 3 min
Speaker 1: Summary: 2 min
Speaker 2: Summary: 2 min
Speaker 1: Crossfire (1 & 2): 4 min
Speaker 2: Crossfire (1 & 2): 4 min
Speaker 1: Crossfire (3 & 4): 3 min
Speaker 2: Crossfire (3 & 4): 3 min
Speaker 1: Crossfire (5 & 6): 2 min
Speaker 2: Crossfire (5 & 6): 2 min
Public Forum Debate | Sherry Meng (*8)  
---|---
**Round 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Faizi</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>A.D. Gadiyar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Osman</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>A.R. Gadiyar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro never addressed Con's framework, which defines "too much power." Although pro had a pretty good rebuttal, none of it was extended. Con's evidence that violation of civil liberty is not due to AUMF, but Patriot Act was not countered, either.
Speaker 1 - No questions presented, well presented.

Speaker 2 - Well done, argued his points well.

Con Speaker 2 - Rushed the end, presented first half.

Pro Speaker 1 - Stronger presence, presence with less pauses would be more effective.

A bit challenging to understand.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Is this a low point win?
(Circle Winner)

Pro (Con)

The winner of this debate was

Brendan Ruiz (Brenda Anderson School/Fishers).
X-fire

Pro

Truman ~ During Korean War
Con ~ Can detain rights of people at GB
Pro ~ Congress can revoke AUMF ~ They have that power
Con ~ No Congressional Approval? ~ PMCs w/o congress. No control
Pro ~ AUMF symbolic ~ Does not give any additional power, just outlines
Pro ~ Prove Efficiency? ~ Does not make US less safe

Pro 2nd

Efficiency? If congress can act efficiently, it's not an issue
Can they

Constitution ~ Does not evenly distribute power

Tripping a little bit

Over ago in the questions a little

Time OUT

Con

Crowd can stop funding @ any time, put it to an end
But... Wm ~ War is unpredictable ~ Some innocents jailed, some not. Is it worth it?

Congress too polarized, slows down costs lives.
AUMF did not start this; it has always been going on

X-Fire 2

Pro ~ Intervention Good vs Efficiency: Presidential Power vs Good to intervene
Not more powerful, was already happening

Con ~

PMCs? President not too powerful if he can help us.

Majority Rep ~ Easy to start a war...
Congress Slow, President Fast

Summary

Pro

Endless War
PMCs not a threat
President not alerted

Con

Wm could have been prevented by strong press
Congress can defend Vietnam War Also, lose to Obama.

PMCs are not U.S. troops ~ Congress cannot control
Con has no rebuttal ~ What if President feels it is good for us.

What is the rebuttal

Pro ~

PMCs to powerful funding illegally taken
President should not be

Con
**Public Forum Debate**

**Bobby Zech**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Shukla</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frey</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Singh</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cordero</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></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:**

**Pro - 1st**

- Articled: Only congress can declare war

**Con - 2nd**

- Will efficiency be decreased?
- Commander in chief only should respond alone if immediate
- AUMF can be revoked at any time. Congress controls troop limits.
- Vietnam War? Syria? AUMF does not give
- Congress only began to make moves when public opinion turned
- Unpredictable War

**Pro Side**

- lots of talking, team work

**Con Side**

- Very little action,
- Bored at one point
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Aashney Shah (*13,12)</th>
<th>Fri 03/09/18 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>SHOwers</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>VENKATACHALAM</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>PANGBORN</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>WEIN</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was Pro Con</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win? No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Pro wins:** Constitutional separation of powers & that Congress is better equipped w/ the power.

**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.
**Public Forum Debate**  
**Ben Pope ('15)**  
**AIA Division 1 State 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>LL271</th>
<th>Fri 03/09/18 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Amin</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Steiner</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sadegi</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>McHenry</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

As a general note to both sides, try to pre-flow your cases so you can get started right away.

Steiner, don't speak under your breath during cross, it makes me feel like you don't have confidence in her. This event is largely about confidence.

Cases:

- **Amin:** Don't have impacts within impacts, use a framework to connect your impacts and create cohesive argument.
- **Sadegi:** Emphasize your impacts more.

**Rebuttal:**

- **Steiner:** Use more cards, rebuttal is almost entirely about dropping their points.
- **McHenry:** Effective use of cards, especially point about president's power.

**2nd Cross:** Steiner, you hardly asked questions, you tried to extend your case, try to maintain civility and source info that flows into case.

**Summary:**

- **Steiner:** Talk with your partner, not at her, it's a team event work together.
- **Amin:** You spent all of your speech conceding points to the Con.

**Grand Cross:**

- **PF:** Why didn't you tell me why you won instead of why they lose?
- **Steiner:** Perpetual war was so strong you barely addressed it.
- **McHenry:** You focused on your weakest points like Bin Laden.

---

**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.
### Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Jimmy Garcia</th>
<th>Fri 03/09/18 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>GUAN</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shih</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>HAMM</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sivak</td>
<td>24</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.

---

RFD: Whether or not you want to vote on the framework set by the Neg the Aff won the debate in both worlds of framework — the more peacefull America is one without the AUM and they proved the president does have too much power with the AUM.

Overall the Con dropped a bunch of cards and refused to believe the 1 forceful and over the was not violating human rights.
Public Forum Debate
Jana Granillo ('15)

Round 1
Speaker
Pro
Points
1st
Martinez
24
2nd
Martinez
26

Con
Points
1st
Skinner
23
2nd
Ruiz
25

The winner of this debate was
Pro
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? YES

Comments & Reason for Decision:
Same thing applies to you all...

Summary: Your guys don't really define "power" and what it means "too much"

Rebuttal: Every time you read evidence you read it in a voice that becomes hard to understand. You also need to defend your case, not just attack when you're second rebuttal.

RFD: The Con team won the debate by their framework was uncontested.

Cure is structural
Super poorly argued
and not well developed & thought out, very confusing

Rebuttal: So, I see you can read... am that good! But a rebuttal is more than just another response if it is not responsive to their case.

Summary: Kinda all over the place (no thanks to the rebuttal). Really should just bullet point, impoins you want to cover at reframe your framework.
Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Ronan McNulty</th>
<th>Fri 03/09/18 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sheng</td>
<td>Shah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Kaira</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Is this a low point win? Yes, actually

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Ultimately, because there was no consensus over FW, I weighed both frameworks essentially equally. I ended up having to judge based classically on which arguments were kept around and which ones were most persuasive. Pro won people but the free press and defending society simply by me not endorsing

Questioning how those created weren't specifically could not work. The biggest reason I went Con is every important responsibility could was extended and largely unmet. Sotul's, Times, Klein weren't essential cases that almost completely restored the offense and they were extended and stood it through. Because the con ended up

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.