<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Quarter-Finals</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1</td>
<td>Speaker 2</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3</td>
<td>Speaker 4</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 5</td>
<td>Speaker 6</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 7</td>
<td>Speaker 8</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 9</td>
<td>Speaker 10</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 11</td>
<td>Speaker 12</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A203</th>
<th>Points (20)</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>JVN</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td>JHII</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was [Circle Winner]

Is this a low point win? [Y/N]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

[Handwritten note:]
I don't really know what you're saying, too much noise, although I am committed to providing you with a useful, logical, and informative perspective of the issue.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches:

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Speaker 1 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 2 Final Focus: 2 min

Judge's Signature: [Signature]

0:00 ET 4/18/18 01:30 PM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VPF: FLIP - Gaylord vs. Srinivasa v. 32 Sun - Shih</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Varsity Public Forum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quarter-Finals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A203</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2/3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2/5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2/6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judge's Signature</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horizon</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Order/Time Limits of Speeches                 |
| Speaker 1 Summary                             |
| Speaker 1 Final Focus                         |
| Speaker 2 Summary                             |
| Speaker 2 Final Focus                         |
| Speaker 3 Summary                             |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus                         |
| Speaker 4                                       |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus                          |
| Crossfire (1 & 2)                               |
| Crossfire (3 & 4)                               |

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

---

**FLIP: Gaylord vs. Srinivasa v. 32 Sun - Shih**

**Varsity Public Forum**

**Quarter-Finals**

**Speaker**

**1st**

**2nd**

**Pro**

**Con**

**Points**

**A203**

**2/3**

**2/5**

**2/6**

**Judge's Signature**

**Horizon**

---

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

**Speaker 1 Summary**

**Speaker 1 Final Focus**

**Speaker 2 Summary**

**Speaker 2 Final Focus**

**Speaker 3 Summary**

**Speaker 3 Final Focus**

**Speaker 4**

**Speaker 4 Final Focus**

**Crossfire (1 & 2)**

**Crossfire (3 & 4)**

---

*The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Quarter-Finals</th>
<th>Pro z</th>
<th>Con y</th>
<th>Comments &amp; Reason for Decision:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge's Signature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelina Dubin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order/Time Limits of Speeches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1 Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2 Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3 Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4 Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Crossfire (all)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 minutes of Prep Time per side</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

- Not really sure... are those all warrants?
- I feel like a couple of them don't link to the AUMF.
- Who really needed more sympathy?
- What was the 'U.S. had it right' thing?
- 'Be the black for me.' It's bring your definition of intervention is?
- I don't think the AUMF was an official alliance.
- What do you mean by 'precision bombing'?
- I think you've been a bit too critical, Fein.
- I also think that those Democrats.

- Good job on the AUMF!

- Good job overall. Excellent delivery.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Quarter-Finals</th>
<th>A205</th>
<th>Point</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VPF</td>
<td>Annu Singh (32)</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Speaker 1</td>
<td>Speaker 2</td>
<td>Speaker 3</td>
<td>Speaker 4</td>
<td>Speaker 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge's Signature</td>
<td>School Affiliation</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

1. Speaker 1
2. Speaker 2
3. Speaker 3
4. Speaker 4
5. Speaker 5
6. Grand Crossfire (a)
7. Grand Crossfire (b)
8. Grand Crossfire (c)
9. Grand Crossfire (d)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Is this a low point win? Yes

**The winner of this debate was Smith**

Overall: Good debate!

Your arguments were offensive and so the neg. may need to be more balanced. Overall, we need turns as opposed to simply using one. Your turns were well formed but neg. FZ was consistent by itself. Offensively, FZ was used well but neg. FZ was constructive.
FLIP: 12 Smith - Hughes v. 36 Pattipati - Zhou

Varisty Public Forum

Quarter-Finals

Speaker 1st

Pattipati

School Affiliation/Occupation
SPA

Judge's Signature

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

Speaker 1
4 min
Speaker 2
4 min
Crossfire 1
3 min
Speaker 3
4 min
Crossfire 2
3 min
Speaker 4
4 min
Crossfire 3 (all)
3 min
Speaker 5
2 min

The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

Points (20-30)

28

23

26

Comments & Reason for Decision:
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- smart

- smart

- smart

- s
e stimulated throughout the debate. 

agreement. From thereon forward, we agree that the final answer lies in the conclusion. Because the NY wins the Pro in the conclusion, because the conclusion needed to examine the "in favor" side, because the debate to the point where only their side provided the evidence. A NY win over the Pw direct, as they officially win.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker 1</th>
<th>Speaker 2</th>
<th>Speaker 3</th>
<th>Speaker 4</th>
<th>Speaker 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ramos</td>
<td>Hevman</td>
<td>Ramos</td>
<td>Hevman</td>
<td>Ramos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Judge's Signature: [Signature]

This is a low point win? (Circle Winner)

Pro

The winner of this debate was

Mary Mcnamara (7)

FLIP: 42 Ramos - Hevman v. 28 Ramos - Tandon

VPF

SWDPII 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A203</th>
<th>166</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>SUN</th>
<th>Shih</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>1st 2nd</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**
- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 3 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 3 min
- Speaker 5: 2 min
- Speaker 6: 2 min
- Speaker 7: 2 min

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**
- **Even Sun:** AUMF is too broad.
- **Even Shih:** Weak, too broad.

**Key Arguments:**
- **Pro:** AUMF is too broad and vague, leading to the abuse of power.
- **Con:** Congress has the power to control the President, thus the AUMF is not necessary.

**RFD:** Ultimately, I think this case comes down to whether or not Congress is adequately able to challenge the President's power, leading to the conclusion that Congress, in this case, is not doing its job.
### Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VPF</th>
<th>FLIP: 42 Ramos - Heyman v. 28 Raolke - Tandon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>28 - 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Side</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Speaker</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Speaker</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Order/Time Limits of Speeches
- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 3 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Summary: 2 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min
- The first question is asked by the speaker.

---

#### Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **Pros:**
  - Good try to rebuttal case
  - Maybe AVMF powers are not just its potential limiting factor

- **Cons:**
  - Appropriate for both PRO
  - Good rebuttal of all PRO

---

#### Explanation:

1. **Is this a low point win?**
   - Yes

2. **Is there cause to offend or AVMF?**
   - No

---

#### Note:

- COHEN, JON
- A212
- Pro
- Vote: 3

---

#### Additional Notes:

- SWSDT 2018
- Jon Cohen (*23)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Quarter-Finals</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was [Pro/Con] (Circle Winner)

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This was close. The Pro summary was quite convincing but ultimately the strength of the con case and evidence carried the day. The con case was not effectively countered by the pro rebuttal. The con case was persuasive on both sides, however, the audience ultimately awarded the con case 30 points to 29.

The con's final round was particularly strong, focusing on the weaknesses of the pro summary and the overall effectiveness of the pro side's arguments. The con side demonstrated a clear understanding of the debate's objectives and objectives, and effectively countered the pro summary's key points.

Pro summary was best speech of round.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Quarter-Finals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Cohen</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Crossfire (1 & 2): 3 min
- Crossfire (3 & 4): 3 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min
- Grand Crossfire (All): 3 min

- The first question is asked by the speaker.
- The second question is asked by the other speaker.

**Comments & Reason for Decision**

Is this a law point? **Con**

The student who authored the speech made the point. The student who authored the speech made the point.

I like how you started about the importance of this topic. You explained how the current state of affairs is quite concerning.

The student who authored the speech made the point. The student who authored the speech made the point.

We need to consider the potential implications of this decision.

The student who authored the speech made the point. The student who authored the speech made the point.

The student who authored the speech made the point. The student who authored the speech made the point.

The student who authored the speech made the point. The student who authored the speech made the point.

I like how you started about the importance of this topic. You explained how the current state of affairs is quite concerning.

The student who authored the speech made the point. The student who authored the speech made the point.

We need to consider the potential implications of this decision.

The student who authored the speech made the point. The student who authored the speech made the point.

The student who authored the speech made the point. The student who authored the speech made the point.

The student who authored the speech made the point. The student who authored the speech made the point.

I like how you started about the importance of this topic. You explained how the current state of affairs is quite concerning.

The student who authored the speech made the point. The student who authored the speech made the point.

We need to consider the potential implications of this decision.

The student who authored the speech made the point. The student who authored the speech made the point.

The student who authored the speech made the point. The student who authored the speech made the point.

The student who authored the speech made the point. The student who authored the speech made the point.
The main topic of this debate is the Constitution of the United States.

The winner of this debate was

Judge's Signature

Pro

Con

1st Round

Gonzales

Con

Points

2nd Round

Con

Points

2nd Round

VARSITY PUBLIC FORUM

STEVE MOSHER (25)

FPF: 23 Cohen - Cohen V. 42 Vaughan - Gonzales

Michael Cohen

Points

Points

18 01:30PM

Saratoga, CA

2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter-Finals</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Cohen T.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Cohen S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Cohen T.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- The debate was close, and both sides presented strong arguments.
- Cohen T. was able to effectively counter the opposing arguments.
- Cohen S. also presented a well-supported case, but Cohen T. had the edge.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep Time</td>
<td>2 minutes per side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first question is asked by the other speaker.