# Public Forum Debate

**Round 3**

<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>McHenry</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Lifshitz</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sadegi</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Vaillancourt</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro framework didn't show it for themselves. No proof that money is less if authorized by congress.

Element of surprise for Quick to Pro did not really understand this argument.

Congessional Gridlock conceivably by Pro to the detriment of their framework.
1) Spontaneous Conflicts
2) Obliteration of Alliances
3) ?
4) Everchanging threat
Speaker 1 - great 1st speech. Nice pace and organization. Got a little repetitive at the end but nice job.

Speaker 2 - You are giving examples of what would happen if POTUS was unlimited, but don't really address the actual resolution closely as it could. Speech lost 40 seconds on the clock, and was a bit scattered, but you did very well in the cross.

Speaker 1 - good job of tying Vietnam to overstepping power & showing that AUNF loosens press need for approval.

Speaker 2 correct. camping on the UN. Contention - it has some holes because of the hypothetical nature. Maybe give other examples of other countries who have had issues with the U.N.?
FLIP: 13 Gustin - Gill v. 17 Bendok - Martinez

Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Tanya Martinez (*2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Bendok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>LL263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Gustin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Fri 03/09/18 05:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Very good debate, loved your energy & passion! I agree, imminent threat definition is too broad. I felt Con was able to convey their side better.

Pro

1st + nice timing & flow
+ drone strikes 5,117 civilians killed
+ 16 years longest war
+ Amuf too broad

- give your conclusion, I urge you to vote "Aff"

Con

1st + very passionate speaker
+ war power reso 30 day limit only; the case of recall
+ Savage card
+ Conceded to definition
+ Clinton drone strikes w/o Amuf

2nd

+ Amuf, no causation = too much power to press
+ Amuf, defensive rate lowering
+ Great crossfire
+ War powers 1973 vs Amuf 2001
+ Broad power with 2001 (5000) defending NY, 1973 did not
+ where you were going - but more convincing w/ Con

+ Perpetual war killed American citizens (compare)
+ Amuf, no causation = too much power to press
+ World War II sunset clause - more broad than war powers reso
+ Great crossfire
+ War powers 1973 vs Amuf 2001
+ Broader power with 2001 (5000) defending NY, 1973 did not
+ Where were you going - but more convincing w/ Con

+ Spoke well, good rebuttal
+ Darwish - Amuf makes less harmful
+ Perpetual war not caused by Amuf - still can occur under war powers reso
+ Existing legislative power to press not uniquely held by Amuf - imminent threat
+ No alternative definition given by Pro

Mathew was see 5b current Amuf
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3 Debate</th>
<th>Emily Su (*5)</th>
<th>Fri 03/09/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Osman</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Faizi</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? [ ]

Judge's Signature: [Signature]

School / Affiliation / Occupation: [Blank]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- I think it's true that you need to link better to pres power
- Rebuttal is really repetitive and ignores all arguments about inappropriately applying AUMF to non 9/11 groups — you can't just use the same analysis for your whole rebuttal lol
- The observation at the top of rebuttal could go in ur case!
- Link from AUMF to 4th Amendment? saw in summary, needs more specifics in case
- Impact out your C3 more
- I end up buying the Aff's observation, I don't see a coherent response from the neg

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.
The debate was well performed by both teams, with well made counters by both. Ultimately, with a very close debate it comes down to the impact of the arguments and the reduction in terrorism. It was not balanced against the claim of increased terrorism. ISIS grew by 4500%, and the negative impacts of the oil effectively I think this could have been argued the other way.
### Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Noah Contreras (*'15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Harriss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Steiner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**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 3</th>
<th>Tyler Rife (*'17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Zhou</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Pattpati</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Did not buy the OCO funding argument that Congress determines Pro's ability to interfere or use AUMT.
- Pro met this quite well.
- Also, the “Power of the Purse” & integration of the Vietnam War example were relatively tough sells.
- Ultimately, here I went with Pro because of a few too many flimsy arguments by the Con that were immediately responded to. Though Ramos provided several very strong grounding points that made this decision difficult to sort through.
## Public Forum Debate

### Round 3

<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>Showers</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Shah</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Venkatachalam</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Kaira</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was:  

Pro **[Signature]**  

Con **[Signature]**  

(Circle Winner)

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

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **Con:** That's like the cleanest case I've ever seen. Props.
- Aff attacked every point about checks and balances.
- Press - Flawed through
- Power of people - Flawed
- Judicial - Flawed
- Congress - Ahh! Where debate stalled. It's not that Congress can't defend against aumf, it's that they won't.

### 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.
**FRANK, WAYNE**

**AIA Division 1 State 2018**

Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Wayne Frank ('2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Gadhiyar</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Gadhiyar</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

As stated after the round, don’t drop argument that were brought up in CX. You proved that terrorism was still increasing & the did not refute this. Should not have dropped the argument of the AUMF giving vague military use, it went unrefuted.

J & H: Never concede to the opponent’s framework, even if they turn it against you. Congress has the Compasy, & you gave an example during CX, also in the final focus, gave the win to the Pro because they had less points related to the **Pro** because they had less points related to the **Summ**ary was revolved around the framework & thought it was a waste of time to restate the same info 3 times in 1 speech.

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 side spoke well, stayed on point and gave solid reasons.

I am giving the win to con because they gave better reasons to keep pum in place than not. Plus I feel like pro relied too heavily on the drone strike argument which really doesn't give weight to one side or the other as it has many good and bad points.
## Public Forum Debate

### Round 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Conf</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Amin</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Skinner</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Steiner</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ruiz</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro ☐ Con ☑

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ☑

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Securing American Dominance & Safety
- Anti-muslim sentiment (AUMF passed quickly)
- Anti-US sentiment (drones strike destroyed infrastructure)
- No stability (uses too much money)
- Bombing Muslims for no reason is this? Maybe not.
- Drones strike on our soil? Proof?
- If Congress can't agree, how can we remove funding quickly?
- Would terrorists wait for a set date?
- Would terrorists specifically targeted (swift action necessary?)

### 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

**Round 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sheng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Bakshi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Cooley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **Bakshi** - you need to understand your one both to be able to answer questions in CX.
- You guys can find

RFD: The Con won the debate b/c they showed that the Pro's arguments were non-viable to the powers of the ALMF/WPA
Con failed to make the connection between attacks in midEast and national security. Pro's claim about no sunset clause in AUMF which puts no ends in war also was intant till final focus. Hill card was also not addressed effectively.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Ronan McNulty</th>
<th>Fri 03/09/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Frey</td>
<td>Frazier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Cordero</td>
<td>Jiang</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*Discharged in 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**

**Xavier Henes (*)14**

**Round 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Xie</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>24</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>Guan</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shih</td>
<td>28</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.

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Neg, add more to case potentiality, is not award resolution topic: Separation of powers.

Aff: some of your analysis doesn’t work like it just doesn’t flow properly — your logic of checks doesn’t flow for me. It really makes no sense.

Framework goes to neg delink off.

Droney
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Meena Shahi ('13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Shukla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Singh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>(20-30) 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was __Con__ (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? __Yes__

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Ultimately, the pro seemed disorganized and dropped a whole lot of arguments. All of the responses to pro's case were unrefuted but then extended, and although the pro kind of hinted they were accepting the quantity for they still lost on that. Although they defended their attack on SA, SB, and SC well, so was a win for the con and a win for the round.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Type</th>
<th>Time Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<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.
### Public Forum Debate

**Aashney Shah** (*'13, '12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>LL268</th>
<th>Fri 03/09/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Knorr</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Flores</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Pejavar</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Mukherjee</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**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:**

This debate was way closer than it honestly had to be. I agree that the neg framework is abusive so I'll drop it but they still win on the aff case. All the aff checks basically end up being a wash so the whole debate is on the aff flow. Aff never responds to the turns on drones or Guantanamo and the warrants to those turns are clearly extended allowing the neg to win the overall debate.