**Public Forum Debate**

**Meena Shahi ('13)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>LL243</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Frey</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Cordero</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Frey

(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:**

- **AFL**
  - Rebuttal is super disorganized & doesn't really respond to Neg case; you must xt ur own case which is a huge problem - pls sign post!!
  - Summary also r disorganized
  - Know your evidence.

- **NEG**
  - Persistent culture of war vs. solving perpetual war seems contradictory
  - You don't prove AUMF effectiveness (ex: w/ Syrian Genocide)
  - Just state terror is bad
  - More work w/ links d/impacting ur specific
  - Summary should be more cohesive
  - Group args in summary, no need to go thru each concept
  - NEVER take prep before crowd

All both need to look at the big picture & both teams need to do more line-by-line
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Russell Gould (*10)</th>
<th>Fri 03/09/18 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>GONZALES</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>VAUGHN</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>SNOWERS</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>VENKATAKALAM</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Pro** - You had a solid delivery
- Work on supplement your 2nd round
- Get a few more facts references
- Snowers - struggled a bit but it didn't effect who won

**Con** - Good job on rebuttals
- Good fact references

- Good form it was fun to judge
FLIP: Singh - Shukla v. Steiner - Amin

Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Jana Granillo (*'15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Shukla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Singh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro

Is this a low point win? Yes

Comments & Reason for Decision:
I end up voting mainly on state sponsors and attacks on them under the AUMF. All other arguments basically end up being a wash. Make sure you guys both explain link stories more clearly and have better understandings of your arguments moving forward!

Good Job! Good Luck!

General Comments:
PRO
- I feel like your 4 could have a better impact
- Need a better link between the AUMF and more intervention.
- Don't need to go for everything in summary, no need to rush yourself, go for what's important.

CON
- Explain the reasoning behind your 4s a bit more
- Know what you bring up in case.
- Your framework is kind of flaky because if we are going to be intervening in the Middle East regardless, why do we need the AUMF?
- If Congress didn't allow Obama to engage in Syria why didn't he under AUMF?


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Mani Kandan (&quot;5&quot;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Vaillancourt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Lifshitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Delgado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Pro continually misused a card stating that 90% of drone strike casualties were innocents, but this was only over a five month period.
- Checks and balances were debated and pro asserted that Congress could not check the President but failed to state how.
- Vaillancourt - great speaker but less attitude please - seemed frustrated.
- Hard to vote for pro when their framework is util but they try to state that 200 civilians > thousands of lives that have been potentially saved by decreasing terrorism over the course of 17 years.
- Great, clean round.

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 2</th>
<th>Tyler Rife ('17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Gustin</strong> 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Gill</strong> 30</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.*

---

- Binaries of "good/bad" lack nuance
- Platitude of how a democracy should function as opposed to how it actually does
- How can Con construct an argument that maintains a critical eye e.g. Should answer the question: Is it possible for Congress to be complicit in an abuse of power by the President?
- Pro built-out argument more than Con, who mainly responded to the initial argumentation instead of how it was responded to in later speeches
- Integrate terms like "complicity" & "groupthink" to help us understand a critical approach to the substantive meaning of "checks & balances"
Public Forum Debate

Round 2

Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30)
1st | Sengupta | 26
2nd | Hepworth | 27

Speaker | Con | Points (20-30)
1st | Gould | 28
2nd | Galardi | 28

The winner of this debate was

Pro   Con
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

It was great watching this debate & I enjoyed the passion & commitment prepared for this debate. It appeared Con side was better versed in the material. I agree with the U.S. National Security outweighs checks & balance of 3 branches govt.

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.

---

1st
- NFL: Congress 48 hrs, U.S. forces limited to 60 days, no Congress intervention
- 2002 amendment war power: risky
- President & Congress slow deliberation, decision making generally takes time

Con
- Checks & balance (3 branches govt.)
- No to Congress 48 hrs, U.S. forces limited to 60 days, no Congress intervention
- President & Congress slow deliberation, decision making generally takes time

2nd
- Framework: National Security Cost Benefit analysis
- Prevent democratic tyranny
- 2 days to destroy vast amount of lives
- 18x Bush, 19 Obama outside it's limits
- during crossfire, continue pressing your 1st question! Con ended up taking over discussion w/his?
**Obs. 1:** "Current" Round in Text
- Too much power weighs harm

**C1:** Insulation

"Necessary and appropriate"

- Drones
  - Dubbed in civilian narratives
  - Drones do not recruit terrorists
  - Misses and stuff
  - Creates conflict
    - Costs a good chunk of change and flesh

**C2:** Misalignment

- Drones are seen as too much power
  - Pres. has too much power to interpret

**FW:** Win
- Existence of checks poses heightened powers
  - Burden of proof:
    - Fun:
      - If power checks and balances

- Congressional action:
  - Politically infeasible
  - Introduction of bill isn't feasible

- Funding:
  - 2 years is way too long

**Rebut:** Hays

- Read, observation:
  - Too much war power
  - Did you just offer new definitions?

**Sum:** -32

- Congress doesn't have checks because 2 yr. limit is too long

- Obama: "Drones aren't a war" included in bill

- Funding: "In peace has meaningful if true
  - If included, are they actually effective"

**FT:** None

- Miscalculation

- Must fund war

**Impact 1:**
- Civilian Legitimacy

**Impact 2:**
- Drones increase recruitment for terrorists

**FF:** +28

- Drones don't fit in annual writing of resolution

- "Funding by
  - "Unanswered by historic example from Pro"

**1st Cross**

- Necessity to check power shows that it has too much
  - Falls in line w/ Pro's Obs. 1

**2nd Cross**

- Abusive by Braun but
  - Weak argued by Hays
**PF**

FLIP: 12 Justice - Hays v. 13 Aberg - Braun

### Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Ben Pope ('15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Aberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Hays</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

**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:**

- **Abad:** Well supported cards and obvious links
- **Justice:** By having only one contention you make your case easy to target and counter.
- **Braun:** Don't argue for solvency too much because you'll lose your stronger impasses
- **Hays:** Be careful not to try to introduce new definitions or means of viewing the round.
- **2nd Cross:** Braun: Don't bold up your hand to silence opponent, if your points are stronger, they will show through. Don't interrupt before he answers your question. No point in asking a question you won't let him answer.
- **Summary:** You have a very strong FW, but you can't just win, they need to more actively attack their case
- **Abad:** Great job highlighting unaddressed portions of your case by the opp
- **Braun:** Much more mellow in beginning, heated up though Braun spoke for 2 minutes, Abad spoke for less than 20 seconds
- **FF:** Braun: Very clearly laid out and well argued however I would suggest spending a little bit more time regurgitating over your own case
- **Hays:** The noun is "resolution" not "resolved.
- You can't reject the status quo because you concede it within your own case.

**RFD:** Pro defeated 1 contention and flowed through the large points
Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Mike Tristano (*'17)</th>
<th>Fri 03/09/18 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Durado</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Perez</strong></td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: The argument presented by the Neg was about the US position rather than the present in Pakistan. Further, the Neg was able to block the arguments presented by the Pro using cards from the 2nd speech. The Pro Neg needs to be careful about assuming the US is the senior of those in conflicts with terrorists. The Neg's Moral Territory argument could have been improved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<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>Bakshi</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Cooley</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro  Con

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both agreed on the framework that checks and balances defines "too much power". Con were able to argue that checks and balances do exist.

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 persuasive and stayed on point.

Both sides made their cases logically and spoke very well. Crossfire + rebutts were clean.

I have to give this to the Con team based on the fact that pro leaned heavily on appeal of power
not related directly to the PMF itself. Con used this point to overpower pro.
FLIP: 15 Faizi - Osman v. 12 Shah - Kalra

Public Forum Debate

Round 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>Osman</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Shan</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Faizi</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Kalra</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? [ ]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

* Violation of Civil Liberties (Surveillance?) of U.S. citizen.
  - Human rights of foreign citizen.
  - Guantanamo (used N.M.F. to justify).
* Lacks Specificity
  - No limits of some sort.
  - Time limit.
* Presidential Abuse
  - Using the power before Congress is able to check.
  - The abuse took place and then was checked TOO LATE.
  - Congress didn't know how N.M.F. would work out.

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.

- Checks + Balances
- Watchdog - Free Press
- Power of the people
- Judicial Review
- Congressional oversight (checks on funding)
  - Power of the purse

(Surveillance not part of N.M.F.
  - Human rights decreased by military intervention.
  - Guantanamo Bay not part of N.M.F.
  - N.M.F. increasing positive outcomes of actions.

Supreme Court did check President.
1. **Power is too broad.**
   - 14 different countries
   - Combat authorization (Drones)
   - Somalia, Yemen
   - Air war
   - 5,117 civ deaths

2. **ALMF**
   - Pres cannot make sound decisions
   - Trump just buys more ammo
   - Creates direct conflict
   - Brown, $5.6T on war
   - 10.1 M refs.

---

**B. Nat. Sec.**
- Killing Osama
- 9/11/01
- Terrorists will continue if Pres does not deal

---

**Congress cannot come together.**
- Slats
- Congress has to approve declaration of war
- 14 different countries
- Def is too broad
- It was used in 14 countries
- Congress can act.

---

**NAT. SEC.**
- Congress would approve ALMF
- Trump would act.
- Drones are not ALMF
- Drone strikes are Ben.

---

**Neg.**
- Has to argue current act would be treason.
- Instability
- Terror has risen
- Somalia/Yemen

---

**Aff.**
- Instability
- Terror has risen
- Somalia/Yemen
- Air wars
- Other case decreases NAT. SEC.

---

This is not a small matter
This is not a small action. Congress would have to work now.

A.F.D. Pro has shown the cost benefit analysis is better than con:

- Instability
- Arguing too much power too the president
- Currently happening
- Drone strikes + Santorini of the boom
- Deaths + overall impacts.
**Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>LL245</th>
<th>Fri 03/09/18 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Tehranchi:</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ori:</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kapadya:</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Bawa</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? 

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Pro:** Let the name war slide because it hadn't, the **Con** would have still won. Based on the Constitution argument as a balance. There still is a possibility of Congress voting against on what they are being paid to do. Did win the argument that AUMF was only meant for the groups associated with 9/11, that went unrefuted.

**Con:** Made it very clear that there was a possible check. Very nice working on that the president doesn't have to do any of this, just that it's available & he chooses to. Intervention is going to happen either way.

---

**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.
## Round 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>Fay</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ad Gadiyar</td>
<td>Hit Gadiyar</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ______

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Martinez**
- Strong argument
- Good evidence
- Excellent
- In cross-exam speechifying
- Then questioning

**Ad Gadiyar**
- Addressed all of the Pro points
- Not always clear with evidence

**Fay**
- Excellent answer to
  - Con framework
- Could use more evidence

**Hit Gadiyar**
- What does HMF do?
- Excellent final focus

---

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker 1</th>
<th>4 min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (1 &amp; 2)*</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (3 &amp; 4)*</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1 Summary</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2 Summary</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Crossfire (all)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3 Final Focus</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4 Final Focus</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Tristan Brown (*'12)</th>
<th>Fri 03/09/18 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Hamm</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sivak</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Frazey</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Jiang</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

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.

---

aff
- dropped congress as
- PMC's
- bring up Syria and Libya

neg
- only problem with my case is this sort of contamination between courts and AUMP
- unless it's not SCOTUS or circuit courts
- tell me explicitly Congress is a less effective regulator of executive branch than judiciary
- give me those warrants
- is AUMP too broad or specific enough? A Mc Keel
PRO
1) Automated - too broad
2) ?
3) Propetural war

CON
1) Checks & balances
**Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Autumn Frey (*1)</th>
<th>Fri 03/09/18 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Steiner</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The winner of this debate was:**

- **Pro** (Circle Winner)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Harriss - had a little difficulty understanding due to speed. I asked to make sure all speech was clear. was able to take a lead speech!

Steiner - passionate and well organized. Terrorism example is a good example but don't camp on that alone.

EXCELLENT 2nd cross on BOTH sides!!

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker 1</th>
<th>4 min</th>
<th>Speaker 2</th>
<th>4 min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (1 &amp; 2) *</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>Speaker 3</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>Crossfire (3 &amp; 4) *</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1 Summary</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>Speaker 2 Summary</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Crossfire (all)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>Speaker 3 Final Focus</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4 Final Focus</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>2 minutes of Prep Time per side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

Guan - excellent speech 1 and explanation of contentions.

Shin - good speech but keep it on the resolution. we aren't debating drone strikes exclusively.

Good conclusion - you definitely did hit the resolution. Shin call into question a card that had to be dropped.

Guan - Good job on summary Shin - nice job pulling up the actual AUMF to check wording. you got pro to drop another argument.

Drones not under AUMF seems to negate the argument by Pro.
### Public Forum Debate

**Xavier Henes (*'14)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>LL249</th>
<th>Fri 03/09/18 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Knorr</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Flores</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

**Judge's Signature**

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

**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:**

Don't debate in cx. There seems to be a few missing links. The summary shouldn't be just a rehash of the rebuttal. Give me notes. The neg needs to see left in summary, sure all of dim War Powers Act quick response? The neg collapses their case by not extending any of their subpoints; they lose any offense and therefore lose the flow.
PF

FLIP: 7 Pangborn - Wein v. 5 Pejavar - Mukherjee

Public Forum Debate

Round 2

<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>Pangborn</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Pejavar</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Wein</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mukherjee</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Why wouldn't you start by defending your case in rebuttal? ... They haven't attacked it.

You don't warrant why all these embargoes would be enacted as a result of going to war.

You all are woefully unprepared for this topic, please meet with your coach & other debaters & watch what they do.

RFD: The Con won the debate today by winning that there are checkson the president's power & this was almost uncontested throughout the entire round. The Con dismantled & turned the pro's 1st contention & defended the 2nd contention.

- No need to spread/speak that first info
- You guys let your opponents get the best of you...incrossed