<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Wayne Frank (*2)</th>
<th>Fri 03/09/18 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>hamm</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>frey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>sivak</td>
<td>corredo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **too much power**
- **value of democracy**
- **AUMF - power to fight terrorism**
- **Congress needs power to enforce AUMF**
- **checks & balances**
- **Congress is not efficient**
- **Congress needs more power**
- **Power of AUMF is needed**
- **AUMF not used for attacks**
- **No checks on power**
- **Value of democracy**
- **Efficiency vs. Democracy**
- **Power not efficient**
- **Abusing power of AUMF**
- **AUMF needs checks for war**
- **Without checks - ill-equipped**
- **What does this mean for our future?**
- **Congress needs more power**
- **AUMF allows no approval**
- **AUMF ≠ Terror = Iraq/Afghanistan**
- **Executive needs more power**
- **Congress needs more power**
- **Congress cannot act fast enough**
- **Power is too weak - not supported**
- **Checks & balances needed**
- **AUMF allows no approval**
- **AUMF does not apply to current conflict**
- **AUMF is symbolic**
- **Congress does not act quickly**
- **AUMF is needed for support of Congress**
- **Reference Congress**
- **Congress needs more for support of points**
- **AUMF does not apply to current conflict**
- **AUMF is symbolic**
- **Congress does not act quickly**
- **AUMF was symbolic**
- **Would be almost same either way**

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Speaker 5: 4 min
- Speaker 6: 4 min
- Speaker 7: 2 min
- Speaker 8: 2 min
- Speaker 9: 2 min
- Speaker 10: 2 min
- Grand Total: 3 min

*The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.*

**PRO WINS BASED ON**

- Presented more substantial evidence & support of points
- showed AUMF does not apply to current conflict
- showed how AUMF violates checks & balances

**CON NEEDED:****

- Reference more for support of points
- Failed to prove Congress can not act quickly
- Said AUMF was symbolic & would be almost the same either way
1. Human life & Safety
   -友情 vs. 美国政策
     -友情是其唯一
   -人类需要
     -友情是唯一
   -友情是唯一

2. Democracy
   -民主的缺失
     -特朗普的权力
     -民主的丧失

3. Constitution
   -宪法的丧失
     -权力的滥用
     -宪法的缺失

Drones
-武器竞赛
  -共和党
  -民主党

 Certain
-内战
-分化战争

Don't make noises when you mess up speaking.
Never admit not having a question when someone asks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>LL269</th>
<th>Fri 03/09/18 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kanaan</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Mittelstedt</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Vaillancourt</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Lifshitz</td>
<td>26</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 outweighed**
- **Pro extended arguments throughout the round**
- **Con did not substantially refute Drones**
- **Con needs to work on fluency and organization**
- **Con should use actual evidence vs. semantics**
- **Never admit to not having a question**
- **Do not make noises when during fluency grades**

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 4</th>
<th>Bobby Zech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sengupta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Hepworth</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 used debate jargon when asked not to for the format.

Neither side explained what war power act does/is. Why did it come into place?

Con had better framework, not challenged well by the Pro side.

Pro just said Congress powerless, did not say how Congress was eroding themselves with power they gave.

Is no reason Congress can't revoke

Does sending troops overseas lead to deploying them @ home?

That would be a pathway to Tyranny
FLIP: 8 Jiang - Frazey v. 17 Steiner - Harriss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>George Justice (*)2</th>
<th>Fri 03/09/18 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Steiner</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro (Circle Winner)

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Key points:
- Harriss great "no sound" argument
- Steiner very strong
- Mix of evidence and plain speaking
- Best of Jiang was judicial killing
- Harriss focus very strong
- Harriss powerful speaker, precise and smart
- Frazey strong (serious to say)
- Harriss Con strong
- Harriss great conclusion
- High in cross.

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.

Great debate, but ultimately, the key "pro" points were more plausible to this judge.
Debate was muddled in semantics regarding constitutionality. Con repeatedly dropped points about terrorism increasing. Eventually, pro flowed through by reminding the group to stay on topic.
Heyman

9/11

No 1 branch should have 100% power. Pro: Pro must prove that power of president is unchecked

C1: Checks

+1 A) Watchdogs

- Congress approves

B) Power of people

- Lack of support hurts president's re-election

C) Judicial Branch

- Judiciary defines it

D) Constitutional authority

- Financial oversight

- Decreases house by 18%

- Power of the purse

1st Cross

Peisnar, when Heyman slips up and concedes declaration of war, parson on that and use it for rest of argument.

2nd Cross

Grand Cross:

FW: Presidents power can't be checked as written in constitution

C2: Al Qaeda

- Attractions of military operations

- Attackers sponsors of terrorism

Impact: Pres can attack on whole state

State Sponsor

- Only authorized for certain groups

- Not true but I went call out if can doesn't

C3: Private military

- Legal under AUMF

- Congress has no control over these troops

Summary

FW: Al Qaeda

Con: haven't proved checks exist

FW:火车 goes against constitution

Summarize

FW: Presidents power can't be checked as written in constitution

FW: Al Qaeda

Summary

FW: Presidents power can't be checked as written in constitution

FW: Al Qaeda

Summary

FW: Presidents power can't be checked as written in constitution

FW: Presidents power can't be checked as written in constitution
FLIP: 5 Pejavar - Mukherjee v. 12 Ramos - Heyman

Public Forum Debate

Round 4

Speaker | Pro | Points (20-30) | Con | Points (20-30)
---|---|---|---|---
1st | Pejavar | 26 | Heyman | 26
2nd | Mukherjee | 25 | Ramos | 26

The winner of this debate was:

Pro [ ] Con [x]

(Circle Winner)

Judge's Signature: [Signature]

School / Affiliation / Occupation: Melnich

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Cases:**

Heyman: Instead of starting with a narrative try beginning w/ FW or observations
Pejavar: The PMC point is very unique and I like the angle you've taken

**1st Cross:**

Be careful of conceding something in the small point like hollows corpses by admitting it's a declaration of war because they flow through the pro
Rebuttal:

Ramos: Be careful asking for cards, DON'T TALK WHILE OPPONENTS DEBATE
Mukherjee: Good job calling for cards. If they pull that you should have more questions.

**2nd Cross:**

Heyman: Ramos: Don't get too dismissive of opponent, it's rude. Don't ask for evidence that he doesn't tell you is in a card
Mukherjee: Too many witnesses, too much evidence, too many cards. Challenge every piece of evidence shows doubt in debate

**Summary:**

Heyman: You introduce nothing new in summary, just recap what was already been said. If you're going to challenge 5 separate cards you have to meaningfully incorporate them.

Grand Cross:

Mukherjee is correct in defense of private contractors. Ramos dominates cross. This is pertinent
Mukherjee, they introduce almost 10 cards, call them out on it.

**FF:**

Ramos: I have hardly ever seen a team behave as rudely as you two. Do not shake your heads. I should disqualify you for how unprofessional and awful you behaved.

**RFD:**

Neither side offered any meaningful definitions which means all I can do is judge based on remaining contentions especially since the framework is abusive. The Pro spent too much time on the defensive which is unfortunate because the Con had a very weak case with little evidence to support any of the comments they make.
Both teams spoke very well and gave good arguments. However, I give the win to Pro because they kept on point regarding what exactly the debate was about. They also gave better points to support their side.
FLIP: 10 Galardi - Gould v. 2 Martinez - Fay

Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Tracy Vaillancourt (*7)</th>
<th>Fri 03/09/18 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Gould 27</td>
<td>1st Martinez 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Galardi 26</td>
<td>2nd Fay 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro Con

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?

Judge's Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

* Lack of Transparency
  Poor credibility due to non-disclosure.
  (Good response on creative)

* Loss of Congressional power (Shirking?)
  (The President's actions before, after)
  (Congress ineffective/inefficient)
  (Too vague) necessary force
  (Congress represents more voices)
  (More constitutional with congressional backing)

* Not too much power as per Congress

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.

- Embedded limits: terrorism only
- Security: Quick reaction
- Human lives
- Constitutionality: ROMF clarifies CIF's role
- CIF must protect US (too many force used?)
- ROMF specifically aid CIF against ISIS
- Not too much power as per Congress
Both teams are great. The round collapsed on whether checks and balances are in place to limit the president's power. Con had a card that states checks reduce the abuse by 18% and congress has reviewed and approved past actions to prove checks do work.
1) Human rights abuses

1) No additional powers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</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>Durado</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Perez</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></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:

- **Excellent 2nd cross on both sides - Nice job!**
- **Grand cross was good on both sides. Civil & productive debate!**
- **I don't think your 1st contention was strong enough to win the round though you presented it well.**
- **You two worked very well together supporting each other during the debate.**
- **Human Rights abuses - nice start. Confident & well organized.**
- **No additional powers over what the pres. already has.**
- **Speaker 2 - Be careful with your use of "like". Elevate your speaking & careful with your speed as well.**
- **Specifically, asked for slow & clear. What I could follow sounded well organized.**
- **Summary - good job on the "quantifying" argument. I'm not sure I follow the international law argument but I would have to research this further myself.**
- **Final - good way to wrap up! I admire your teams organization - you are very well prepared.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order/time limits of Speeches</th>
<th>Speaker 1</th>
<th>Speaker 2</th>
<th>Speaker 3</th>
<th>Speaker 4</th>
<th>Speaker 5</th>
<th>Speaker 6</th>
<th>Speaker 7</th>
<th>Speaker 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crosfire (1 &amp; 2) *</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosfire (3 &amp; 4) *</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosfire 2</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1 Final Focus</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2: Final Focus</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3: Summary</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4: Final Focus</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first question asked by the speaker should be a speaker response. 2 minutes of Prep time per side.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Is this a low point win? [Pro/Con]

The winner of this debate was [Pro/Con]

Pro: [Speaker Name]

Con: [Speaker Name]
### Public Forum Debate

**Meena Shahi (14)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>LL240</th>
<th>Fri 03/09/18 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Amin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Steiner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Judge's Signature**

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Explain the warrant for anti-Muslim sentiment. I know the line is there but you guys don't give yourself enough time in case to do that.
- Do more to talk about how it's not too much power.
- Don't really get how just war theory is the justification for this power.
- Be careful with AUMP not proving enough cause.
- Why is President the best actor?
The affirmative needs a framework. Also, the affirmative doesn't need time quality and quantity. Links are missing on both sides, but the affirmative has a huge problem with links in their rebuttal. The major problem with the affirmative is that although they make a good attempt, the affirmative becomes a Social Club. Aff is a bit rude.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Aashney Shah (*13,12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>ADITYA GADIYAR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>ARJUN GADIYAR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th><strong>Con</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>MARTINEZ</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>BENDOK</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I don't buy the Pro analysis about how we should be talking about presidential power versus the president versus Congress. The Con does not win by lobbying or advising which is their only response to the Pro statement which means those impacts flow through. However, it mostly comes down to the president's actions which are not necessarily explained by the AVMA. The Con card says the president has used it as his sole justification but could be interpreted more broadly which still falls under him using it to justify military action.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches:

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

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
**Round 4**

<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>Xie</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Shukla</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Singh</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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:**

Con argument that checks are in place were effective but I believe outweighed by the pro impact argument. The evidence that terrorism has decreased was not overwhelming the impact of what can occur in sixty days stated by the pro argument.
As mentioned, this was a mess and many of your arguments supported the other teams. The topic with the best clash was deterrence—deterrence, and the Pro team showed that the benefit of fast interaction was actually a cost because increased interventions hurt America by inciting terror and bothering our allies. Con also defended Human Rights violations, which hurt their case because that's an automatic abuse of power if unpunished.
# Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Alex Wakefield (*'13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Knorr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Flores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Zhou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Pattipati</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge’s Signature</th>
<th>School / Affiliation / Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVHS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

```
Ultimately the con was better prepared, more ready, and more persuasive. There was more evidence presented in a more convincing way, and it was presented in a way conducive to the event and to basic principles of logic. Pro dropped points and did not cover much ground in summary, whereas con extended key responses solidly throughout, giving them more FTV, domestrikes, and oversight.
```