

K. Grover

US 221 Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tourn. date: Jan. 14-15, 2017 Time: 3:00 PM Tournament: Cavalier Invitational 2017

Rd. F Room: US 221 Grouping: PF Section: FINAL Judge: Kurren Grover (U26) Affiliation/ Occupation: Durham Academy (U26)

Debaters: William Thompson and Quentin Levin (The Potomac Sc TL) vs. Paul Snyder and Emma Smits (Pinecrest High SS)

Resolution --

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing either the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

Table for First Team: School: Pinecrest High SS, Side: Pro, Speaker 1: Emma Smits, Speaker 3: Paul Snyder, TEAM Points: 30

Table for Second Team: School: Potomac TL, Side: Con, Speaker 2: William Thompson, Speaker 4: Quentin Levin, TEAM Points: 29

Rate each TEAM: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Table for Winning Team: Pro, Winning Team/Code: Pinecrest SS, Judge's signature, Low point win? No

- Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

Emma Use Potomac's non-topical responses to humanitarians and to kick out of their multiple turns in summary. I think the round would've been able to have been cleaner had you agreed humanitarians and nation-building so no negative harms would occur and then stayed done.

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

I vote Aff in this debate. It was incredibly close, but for me it came down to evidence. To evaluate, I look to stability as Aff drops theirs in FF, and I think Aff did a good job of winning chronos. I buy that its better than alts, and that connecting ISIS would be better w/ 7 drone strikes. The Singer turn Neg uses is dropped in summary so I don't look to it. The Aff also tells me w/modernization there is a definite b in attacks, and I buy that at that point recruitment is most.

For humanitarians aid, I really am left w/ Neg telling me that this ↑ duration and enhances state failure, and also that it ↓ conflict 80% and increases cooperation. The problem here is that Sullivan's Neg analysis is only Sullivan explaining / defining / model of aid and she says that these countries only overtly don't coop to maintain appearance, it doesn't even say whether coop actually goes ↓. Later that same paragraph she describes a completely different model while making no judgement again. At this point, I have to look at 80% ↓ conflict vs. prolonged duration, and since no one weighed them together, I favor the ↓ in conflict over the ↑ in duration. The Mueller turn is at best inconclusive to me as Mueller is only pointing out that the jump from military dependent developing democracies to non-military is 5x, but Neg doesn't tell me / prove that humanitarians aid = military assistance, only that they could be dependent. At best, I can't grant the full offense you guys want, and at worst, I can't buy at all. As for as Neg constructive, you don't answer the double-bind, you guys drop debt, and only answer the fact that not ↑ spending = others thinking we're near w/ Asian pivot but Paul's response does enough to create a war. Your arg then becomes a counterfactual of voting Aff necessarily doubles spending, which doesn't do enough against the Aff offense.

Comments to debaters:

Handwritten scribbles in the comments to debaters box.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches table with columns for speaker/summary/crossfire and time limits (4 min, 3 min, 2 min).

https://www.speechwire.com/tabroom/judges-ballot-debate.php?selgroupingid=7&selround=F&sortby=judgecode&Submit=Print+ballots&ballotnote= 2/3

N. Spector

US 221 Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tour. date: Jan. 14-15, 2017 Time: 3:00 PM		Tournament: Cavalier Invitational 2017	
Rd. F	Room: US 221	Grouping: PF Section: FINAL	Judge: Nicole Spector (K1)
Affiliation/ Occupation: Cary Academy (K1)			

Debaters: William Thompson and Quentin Levin (**The Potomac Sc TL**) vs. Paul Snyder and Emma Smits (**Pinecrest High SS**)

Resolution --

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing *either* the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
School: Pinecrest	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	TEAM Points (out of 30)	School: POTAMAC	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	TEAM Points (out of 30)
Speaker 1 Name: EMMA SMITS	30		Speaker 2 Name: WILLIAM THOMPSON	30	
Speaker 3 Name: PAUL SNYDER			Speaker 4 Name: QUENTIN LEVIN		

Rate each TEAM: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Winning Team: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Winning Team/Code:	Low point win?
Judge's signature: <i>Nicole E. Spector</i>		

- Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- No new arguments** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

MODERNIZATION MEANS ↑ SPENDING
NOT ↑ ARMS, DELINEATE
THAT POINT IN CONTEXT OF
ARMS WAR
GREAT/CALM QUESTIONING OF

Comments to debaters:

~~MODERNIZATION~~ EXCELLENT DEVELOPMENT
OF ROADWAYS PRIOR TO SPEAKING
~~ALSO~~ HUMANITARIAN AND ALWAYS
INVOLVED TROOPS ON GROUND: THIS WAS
A LEAP

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

- NO INCREASE STAMM AND UKRAINE CONFLICTS
- INTERPRETATION OF SULLIVAN EVIDENCE: MISREP BY BOTH SIDES AT TIMES BUT ESP BY CON
- AID EXAMPLES: THE CHERRY PICKING OF REGIONS FOR ARGUMENT IS NOT LEGITIMATE. EXAMPLES CAN BE GIVEN TO BOTH SIDES BUT COOPERATION VALUED IN SULLIVAN SUPPORT PRO
- ~~CON ARG~~ DEPT ARGUMENTS FAIL TO PROVIDE LINEAR EVIDENCE FOR DUSTAB (N MILIT/INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT)
- INCREASING HOSTILITY FROM CHINA/RUSSIA IN PAST 5 YRS DESPITE ↓ MILIT SPENDING DISPUTES CON + UNADDRESSD

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

E. Lee

US 221 Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tourn. date: Jan. 14-15, 2017 Time: 3:00 PM Tournament: Cavalier Invitational 2017

Rd. F Room: US 221 Grouping: PF Section: FINAL Judge: Emma Lee (U9) Affiliation/Occupation: Durham Academy (U9)

Debaters: William Thompson and Quentin Levin (The Potomac Sc TL) vs. Paul Snyder and Emma Smits (Pinecrest High SS)

Resolution --

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing either the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

Table for First Team: School: Pinecrest, Side: Pro, Speaker 1: Emma Smits, Speaker 3: Paul Snyder, TEAM Points: 30

Table for Second Team: School: Potomac, Side: Con, Speaker 2: William Thompson, Speaker 4: Quentin Levin, TEAM Points: 29

Rate each TEAM: < 20 Unethical/Inappropriate Behavior 20-23 Below Average 24-26 Average 27-28 Above Average 29-30 Outstanding

Summary table: Winning Team: Pro, Winning Team/Code: Pinecrest SS, Judge's signature: Emma Lee

- Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.

Comments to debaters:

Both of you did a great job w/ end of round strategy - your voters were clear and all speeches were super easy to follow.

Comments to debaters:

Unless you plan on dropping your CI early you need a better way to impact to conflict esp. when that's how you frame the round every speech. FF covered a lot which helped you but needed to be condensed. Too all over the place.

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

Really good Round everyone. Ultimately Arms Race arg & Humanitarian Aid got so muddled I had no clear way to vote on either. If Con had gone more for the dependency turn earlier & developed it more I would have given it to them but Colicor & Columbia are extended enough for me to buy that conflict goes down. W/ the arms race arg I don't have enough evidence from NCG that I believe they're going to use them or any probability analysis. I end up having to vote on drones & being able to lower attacks & the magnitude of attacks etc. I also buy the NYX which takes out the Wernburg card & buy they're better than air strikes etc. Really great job & good luck w/ the rest of the season!!

Order/Time Limits of Speeches table: 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