

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College SC

Sarah Cogan

Max = 30

~~28~~ 29

NEGATIVE

Scarsdale LM

Larry Milstein

POINTS

Max = 30

~~29~~ 29.5

The better debating was done by the Neg from Scarsdale LM
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

[Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff - Larry is pretty good at asking questions that could potentially undermine your case. For this reason, you should understand your case implications and potential arguments against your position, e.g. realism as a moral theory would justify state-sanctioned genocide to protect the state.

Neg - You came into this round w/ a load of arguments pre-written, which is good - but that shouldn't discourage you from making substantive responses off of the AC

B/c of the mutual agreement on how this round should be adjudicated, I give you both high speaks.

Also, I admire Aff's attempt at creating a pre-fiat argument for women's youth in debate.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT
Hendrick Hudson HS
November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
NFA VB	Max = 30	Scarsdale RG	Max = 30
Victor Bramble	<u>28</u>	Rahul Gosain	<u>28</u>
The better debating was done by the <u>AFF</u> from <u>NFA VB</u> <small>AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME</small>			
Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____			
Signed: <u>[Signature]</u>			

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

~~LEGAL~~ / RIGHT TO LIFE / CCPR

48M: UNINSURED 3-4 MORE TIMES

UNHEALTHY

POSITIVE OBLIGATION

HANDLED CX WELL - NEG. ATTEMPTING TO CONFUSE YR ISSUE

* 20% VS 3% EOL VOTE BY UNINS. IS WELL

DOUGHT - AN OBLIGATION LEGAL 2ND

WE SIGNED THE CCPR

TOP OF AC - DOUGHT DEFUSED

NEG.

LEGAL vs MORAL

INTERNATIONAL LAW?

EFFECTIVE CX

GOVERN. MUST ACT IN UTILITARIAN FASHION

FREE MARKET

BIO-TECH - BIO-TERROR

REWARDS INNOVATIONS IN PRIVATE SECTOR

PROFIT DRIVEN MARKET WILL WORK w NEG.

UNW. HEALTH. LONG TERM SUFF.

MORAL OVER LEGAL (DOUGHT)

UHC MAKES IT WORSE FOR CITIZENS

PRIVATE ENT. - INCENTIVES NEW MEDS -

OWN & SEEK BEST CARE PROV.

UHC PROMOTES INNOVATION?

THE NEG: PRIVATE ENT. - PROFIT / INCENTIVE DRIVEN BUT W

AFF WOULD 48 million more people potentially under their care

THE US gov. OUGHT (morally) preserve this positive obligation AS RESOL. STATES

AND ALSO LEGALLY PER THE ICCPR MANDATE WEATHER IS MORAL OR LEGAL

AFF: DOUGHT / 48 million more CUSTOMERS' P/DRUGS, HEALTH CARE

AFF NEVER CONSIDERED DOUGHT WAS MORAL OBLIGATION, JUST AN OBLIGATION

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

Lexington AH

Adam Hoffman

POINTS

Max = 30

28

NEGATIVE

Stuyvesant DW

Dillon Wu

POINTS

Max = 30

27

The better debating was done by the AFF from Lexington AH
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

45K DIE/YR w/o insurance
currently a market commodity
NOT A SOCIAL SERVICE
MAX. U.S. CITIZ. WELL BEING
SINGLE PAM SYSTEM
PREVENTATIVE CARE SAVES \$ + LIVES
MILWAUKEE JO CARD - BETTER COORDINATED
HEALTH
NEW TAXES? NEVER STATED
ALL IMPLEMENTED w/ EXIST. TAX
9 STATES
IF WE DID NEED RAISE TAX: SIN
ON CIG.

NEG

MONEY vs LIVES: SAVES?
ALL PARTS MUST BE TRUE TO BE TRUE
RESPECT INDIV. AUTONOMY
TAXING PEOPLE VIOLATES INDIV. AUT.
HOSPITAL INEFF: CANADA / BRIT.
ECONOMIC COLLAPSE w/ UNHEALTHY
NUCLEAR WAR
HIGH TAXES - ECON. COLLAPSE - GLOBAL COLLAPSE
NUCLEAR WAR
THE TAXES VIOLATING AUT.
NO TAX IN NEG WORLD! ADMITTED IN CX
WHETHER IT WAS SUPPOSED TO BE PROVEN OR
NOT.
PAYROLL TAX INCREASES UP?
WHAT ABOUT SAVINGS OR INDIV. PARTS
FOR CURRENT HEALTH CARE?
THE ECONOMIC COLLAPSE FRAMEWORK
IN THE AFF NEG CASE SINCE ITM

AFF: EXCELLENT FRAMEWORK IN A/C

NEG: GOOD PTS ON HOSP. INEFF. — CLOSING UP / KILLING?

AFF: DOES NOT IMPLEMENT NEW TAXES — TAKES OF NEG: GLOBAL COLLAPSE THEREBY
THE NO TAXES IN THE NEG. WORLD NOT COLLAPSE OUR ECONOMY?
THIS WAS THE ROCK THAT SUNK THE NEG. CASE

IN THE AFF WORLD, GOVERNMENT SPENT FUNDED w/ TAXES (NOT ECON COLLAPSE)
AND 45K PEOPLE /YR DON'T DIE w/o INSURANCE
AFF MAXIMIZES GOV. OBLIGATIONS TO CITIZENS

Room: 134
Flight A: Start 6:15
Varsity LD

2

Walker, Rachelle

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE *SL*

POINTS

Bronx Science ID

Isis Davis-Marks

Max = 30

28

NEGATIVE *SL*

POINTS

Collegiate MA

Matthew Agar-Johnson

Max = 30

29

The better debating was done by the NEG from Collegiate MA
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Rachelle Walker

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

SL

ORAL

Room: 114
Flight A: Start 6:15
Varsity LD

2

Zavislan, Matt

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science BR

Max = 30

Scarsdale MB

Max = 30

Bill Reisman

24

Michael Bogaty

~~24~~ 26

The better debating was done by the Neg from Scarsdale MB
AFF & NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Matt Zavislan

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

ORAL

- ① Util
- ② Imposes deaths @ violation. = NB o/w the Aff
- ③ gov care bad anyway.

Room: 113
Flight B: Start 7ish
Varsity LD

2

Singh, Sunpreet

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT
Hendrick Hudson HS
November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Livingston High JX	Max = 30	Scarsdale SF	Max = 30
Jessica Xu	<u>28</u>	Steven Friedman	<u>28.5</u>
The better debating was done by the <u>Neg</u> from <u>Scarsdale</u>			
<small>AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME</small>			
Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____			
Signed: <u>[Signature]</u>			

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

ORAL

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
NFA JH	Max = 30	Bronx Science AF	Max = 30
John Hordines	<u>27</u>	Aeshah Farrouq	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from NFA JH
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Omri Drucker

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD: Extended arg that consequentialism
must come first, gives more weight
than the extension that
autonomy comes first, gives ~~themselves~~ substantive text
~~that~~ reason to prefer. AFF has offense
extended

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Collegiate NE

Max = 30

Nathan Ewing-Crystal

28.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Berkeley Carroll CS

Max = 30

Charles Sherman

27

The better debating was done by the Aff from Collegiate NE
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- AG- Great case, very well read
NC- Too much time on NC, its over 5 minutes long. Trim it so ya
Can spend more time on case.
IAR- Good speech. Great analysis on the relationship between
Step and participation
NR- You don't extend the link to the DA. I can't pull the
trigger without it. You need to do more work on step, though.
You have to do something about his definition of right
ZAR- You read my mind. Good work with extending right. It
closes the door in regards to step. Also, good job w/ the
NC and extending the prob. arguments
RFD: Either step or participation. Aff wins the double bind

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT
Hendrick Hudson HS
November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Byram Hills CG	Max = 30	Bronx Science ES	Max = 30
Claudia Greenspan	24	Ean Steinberger	26

The better debating was done by the neg from Bronx ES
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Matt Zavislan

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

ORAL

~~WRITTEN~~

- ① Util is true use of extinction means I negate
- ② Aff responses here are new in 2AR means 100% prob nullify Aff dis/weighting attempt.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Max = 30

Hunter College JC

Joanna Cohen

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Max = 30

Byram Hills DS

Daniel Spingarn

27

The better debating was done by the AFF from Hunter JC
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

DNR

I think AFF makes it easy because, at least, feasibility is a prerequisite for desirability. Because I believe AFF's argument about Amending the Constitution to resolve concerns about desirability, & b/c I see her will/dignity/minimizing arbitrariness as being though, it's clear that we would, behind the veil, adopt a scheme that provides help to the least well-off, because that could be you. The last point of possible conflict comes off second contention of the NEG, that only ~~for~~ some doctors won't even help people w/ Universal Health Care. I buy AFF's argument that that doesn't preclude everyone from getting care, it just means they can't go to any doctor they want. So I affirm.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Byram Hills LL	Max = 30	Fiorello LaGuardia LM	Max = 30
Lexi Leib	<u>27</u>	Lena Mandell	<u>28.5</u>
The better debating was done by the <u>Neg</u> from <u>LaGuardia LM</u>			
<small>AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME</small>			
Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____			
Signed: <u>[Signature]</u>			

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AL- Good case, well read.

NC- Great case and answers to AL framework. I like the use of Nozick here

IAR- You need to spend more time on the NC framework and externalism. This argument is damning to the AL

NR- Great speech, you make clear extensions of the NC and do a great job with framework analysis

ZAR- too little too late on the AC turns. These responses need to be in the IAR.

RFD: Nozick and Tanner take out practical reasons. Flores shows fear wouldn't rationally want health care

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Monticello BS

Max = 30

Brittany Stein

28.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College DL

Max = 30

Danny Li

29.0

The better debating was done by the neg from Hunter
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Orrie

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The Aff value is morality and VC is adhering to citizen's wellbeing
The Neg value is also morality and VC is accounting for equal opportunity
The Neg argues that the Aff standard is ~~util~~ based and that we should focus on equal opp not equal outcome. The Aff however points out that util is focused on increased opportunity, not outcomes. As such the Aff accepts the neg standard and I apply it to the round. Both sides in effect argue that we should focus on the access and not the outcome. As such a lot of the arguments between the two sides become moot.

The Aff however made a fatal drop in not responding to the Negs Randall and AAPs cards showing that util offers less access to certain people. As such the neg prevails under its framework and also under the Aff framework. I negate

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Lexington MH

Max = 30

Michael Heyang

27.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science SS

Max = 30

Shai Szulanski

28.5

The better debating was done by the Neg from BS
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The aff value is general welfare and VC is promoting welfare in accordance w/ the Constitution. The neg value is morality and VC is respecting autonomy. The neg did not challenge the aff framework and the aff did not challenge the neg framework. I thus must rely on contentions.

The aff case depends on single payer plan and explains how it solves the woes of the current system. The neg argues that we must respect individual autonomy and thus cannot have the gov offer universal HC, or take any other corrective action that increases taxation or violates autonomy. The neg did not challenge any of this and as a result the aff case is largely blocked by the autonomy argument. The neg also challenged the aff case at all levels (reduced costs, reduced access, removing admin. costs), unless aff can show a solution that avoids taxation or reducing autonomy - the aff failed to do so.

As to the gov's obligation to promote welfare - that obligation may exist but the aff must show how it meets its obligation w/o falling into the neg trap. Last minute argument that neg framework doesn't work cannot come in the RR2 and is ignored. I negate.

Room: 230
Flight A: Start 6:15
Varsity LD

2

Drucker, Omri

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Monticello PC	Max = 30	Stuyvesant SV	Max = 30
Peter Chocolate	<u>28</u>	Sweyn Venderbush	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Monticello PC
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Omri Drucker

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RED: Voted on the RVI to Henry. Just because PC read an
I meet doesn't mean that he can't get an office off
it indicating NEG for reading theory in the first place
using his counter interp.; extends on RVI on family
that he is strongly convinced

Room: 126
Flight B: Start 7ish
Varsity LD

2

Dunworth, Jonath

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Lexington HK

Max = 30

Hannah Kwon

26.5

NEGATIVE

Liberty

POINTS

NFA JG

Max = 30

Jordanne Gizzarelli

27

The better debating was done by the NO from NFA JG
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I don't think your appeal to the constitution's preamble is particularly convincing.
I think in your IAR you could be more specific as to where this obligation comes from to provide healthcare. Read the warrentin after speeches

I don't understand the capitalin offe...
I think your case is pretty open to being turned in that you talk about several wrongs in the constitution and it seems like 45,000 deaths is a pretty big thing.

RFD: I vote off of constitution obligation

Room: 126
Flight A: Start 6:15
Varsity LD

2

Dunworth, Jonath

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

111

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Stuyvesant SH

Max = 30

Samantha Hom

29

NEGATIVE

150

POINTS

Scarsdale GT

Max = 30

Garrett Tanzer

27

The better debating was done by the Aff from Stuyvesant SH
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I really liked the arg. Well researched.
"Fix IAA" insofar as he doesn't really
respond to any justifications for
criticism, just extend ones

I didn't understand 1st response
to veil of ignorance
I think you need to do more on
her contention level at this point
if she wins, veil of ignorance she wins
round.
The response to her I I am
not buying

REF: I vote off will

Room: 128
Flight B: Start 7ish
Varsity LD

2

Gilbert, Craig

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College BL

Max = 30

Ben Laufer

26

NEGATIVE

Scarsdale BU

POINTS

Max = 30

Ben Ulene

29

The better debating was done by the

Neg
AFF or NEG

from

Ben
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Theory

Room: 128
Flight A: Start 6:15
Varsity LD

2

Gilbert, Craig

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills AJ

Amos Jeng

Max = 30

27

NEGATIVE

Bronx Science DM

Daiya Massac

POINTS

Max = 30

27.5

The better debating was done by the

AFF or NEG

from

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Jan

Daiya needs to read up
on his will to power,
but the dis ad is undercover
and sufficient for my ballot

Room: 233
Flight B: Start 7ish
Varsity LD

2

Walker, Rachelle
Goffman

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS
November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Sacred Heart AT	Max = 30	Monticello DT	Max = 30
Adam Tomasi	<u>27</u>	Dustin Thomas	<u>25</u>
The better debating was done by the <u>Aff</u> from <u>Sacred Heart</u>			
<small>AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME</small>			
Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____			
Signed: <u>[Signature]</u>			

1:34
N:57

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Remember that thing about not making me want to kill you and/or myself?

1 min + ~~30 sec~~ to find place - Uhhh what just happened?

Ask before flex prep...

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

Bronx Science SG

Sam Goree

NEGATIVE

Berkeley Carroll WW

William Wells

28.4

26

The better debating was done by the

Aff

Bronx Science SG

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended.

Signed:

Chetan Hertzog

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

(NC) you need to explain what it means for people to take responsibility for one's actions. You need to explain how we measure chorofrights (also, it sounds like you have 2 different standards in the case). You need to flesh out your 2nd contention so it seems like a more developed argument. Answers to the AC should be much more structured - there are a lot of places to make response, but I don't really hear you signposting or clarifying when you are/what you're doing on the flow. You should try to number and label all answers you make. (1AN) Good job focusing on turns to the AC. You should flesh some of them out more so that there's more for him to answer. I like the use of cards here. Extensions from your case should be more complete - extend warrants and impacts, not just claims and names. You should offer a bigger single piece of offense for me to consider when voting. (2AN) Signpost so I know where you are! You need to be more disciplined. (2AN) you need more structure.

(2AN): The neg is really unfocused/unstructured, so I don't know where his args go or how they function. Aff concedes neg fw, so I'm looking for some sort of rights maximization. (1) (Himmelsstein) Aff the AC shows costs decrease when we have VHC. (2) (Hurley) + (Hurley 2) extended from the AC show why VHC upholds rights to take other kinds of action beyond just existing. There's no reason to negate, so I affirm.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS
November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE **NEGATIVE**

Byram Hills JA
Josh Altman

Monticello PM
Patrick Miraglia

The better debating was done by the **AFF** from **Byram Hills JA**

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: **Matt K. Witt**

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

might also think about providing more specific for your util FW. Just using justifications for a policy FW doesn't really do it, since policymakers can't do consider deontological issues (eg, racial profiling or due process). I don't understand why this case is structured as a dival. It seems to really be about rejecting the policy mindset the aff is using. I don't quite get the strategy of this speech; you need evidence to answer each his claims, and you should have indicted his framework to give yourself more layers with which to answer the AC. I think ending 3 minutes early is a bit problematic, since you're giving up a lot of opportunities to make new arguments and weigh. You should answer everything he says against the AC, since he really didn't say that much. I like the way you extend Davenport, but you need to do more direct clash. Also, you should have offense against his dival. (You have one turn, but should make more.) Speech is quite repetitive - I'm only hearing one arg (you gain too much control), which is repeated several times. You need to vary it a bit. Good speech, but give me voting issues in some form.

RFD: I don't know what anyone is linking to, since neither debater extends a standard. Neg's disad/K/whatever it is goes away b/c (1) Davenport shows why aff advocacy doesn't eliminate privatized care, (2) Tony shows that what neg kritiks isn't UNC, and (3) aff doesn't mandate the care. The extensions of Phillips and Royal so uncontested, so I affirm.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College AM

Max = 30

Alberto Malaney

27.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Lexington TM

Max = 30

Teddy McKenna

28

The better debating was done by the Neg from Lexington
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Anna Lu

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- try to make your constructs crystal clear into terms of layout → highlight tag lines / key arguments
- try to be more articulate
- construct warranted well, but no real credible response to neg's cancer argument and neg's argument about research to be destroyed over time because it kills medical innovation.

Based on Nagahy 3 and argument about lack of medical innovation in aff world, and ~~team~~ overall cancer argument → neg outweighs on impact and neg ~~picks up~~ had better debating based on rebuttals, arguments, ~~and~~ coverage of opponents case

Neg

- good articulate speaker - construct clear / well warranted
- Boston Globe evidence good →
- cancer argument compelling
- good job with making your impacts clear in terms of outweighing
- Nagahy 3: cards good → at taking out aff's Sanchez card

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Harrison AG

Max = 30

Amy Geller

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Fordham Prep DJ

Max = 30

David Joannides

28

The better debating was done by the Aff from Harrison
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- Construct laid out ~~well~~ ^{clearly} and well warranted
- if you're ~~affirming~~ advocating for a single payer system - make sure you understand the details as to ^{rights} how it would operate -- during cross - x of you, seemed as if you were uncertain about things when questioned about how program would be funded; and how all people would be serviced
- Good rebuttal to Neg's argument about right to property -- ~~but~~ ^{what} warrant about no entitlement
- good argument about ^{to neg's} corporations need developing not still ~~be~~ being in existence and making medicine ~~to~~ in aff world →
- Framework of ~~aff~~ ^{aff} wins → and achieving sta.
- Based on better arguments, rebuttals, warrants, → aff wins.

Neg

- Cross - x of Aff - good job of ~~for~~ using time to find weaknesses in opponent's arguments.
- construct interesting / well warranted
- good rebuttal to about health care in hands of states would be potentially ~~less~~ ^{more} responsive, easier to allocate resources, and less bureaucratic versus being 1- hands of government
- make sure you crystallize clearly by providing votes
- 1NR → try to rebut opponent's case and not drop any arguments → you dropped (2) for aff
- ~~yes~~ ^{yes} would have been better if ~~aff~~ ^{neg} rebuttals were warranted
- ~~aff~~ ^{neg} did better job of

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Harrison PG

Max = 30

Patty-Jane Geller

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College RH

Max = 30

Rebecca Heilweil

29

The better debating was done by the Neg from Hunter College RH
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Pat Luccarelli

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff V = just government and C = preserve equal access to negative rights
Neg V = morality and C = consistency with US Constitutional principles. Neg
argues that this is not a Federal issue, but a state one instead

RFD
1) Aff convinces me that the ~~Aff~~ Neg framework does not tie together because the Constitution has been immoral and does change → so not a good basis for morality
2) However, Neg shows that her C does link to Aff V, so I vote on which case provides the most 'just ~~gov~~ government'

3) Neg argument that the Const does not specify UHC is compelling. Aff Jones and Hoffman 1 tie sickness to security but Neg contends that is a stretch.
Aff argument that Powers and Hoffman 2 with incentive system to stay healthy still does not say why
~~Neg~~ Fed is responsible

So Neg is convincing that her case with clear responsibilities of the Constitution is the best way to have a just government. Aff does not convince that providing UHC is mandated for Fed gov't

Room: 109
Flight B: Start 7ish
Varsity LD

2

Pritt, Jacob

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science BA

Max = 30

Benjamin Adegbite

27.6

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Monticello LS

Max = 30


Lucas Smith

28.2

The better debating was done by the Neg from Monticello
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Oral

Room: 109
Flight A: Start 6:15
Varsity LD

2

Pritt, Jacob

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Regis BK

Max = 30

Barrett King

27.5

NEGATIVE

Needham MG

POINTS

Max = 30

Matt Goldberg

28

The better debating was done by the Neg from Needham
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

oral

Room: 113
Flight A: Start 6:15
Varsity LD

2

Singh, Sunpreet

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Regis PM	Max = 30	Lexington JS	Max = 30
Peter McGahren	<u>27</u>	Julia Sun	<u>27.5</u>
The better debating was done by the <u>Neg</u> from <u>Lex</u>			
<small>AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME</small>			
Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____			
Signed: <u>Sunpreet Singh</u>			

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I negate. I buy neg standard, and both to the contention that links. The aff turn is non-unique b/c the last card in the NC. Both debaters left alot up for the judge to evaluate on his own.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Lexington CD	Max = 30	Scarsdale CB	Max = 30
Caroline Dugan	<u>27.5</u>	Charlie Blatt	<u>29</u>
The better debating was done by the <u>Neg</u> from <u>Scarsdale</u>			
<small>AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME</small>			
Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____			
Signed: <u>[Signature]</u>			

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AC: FW needed a ^{defined} ~~clear~~ standard, + better warranting

NC: Stat skew argument was unnecessary.

CX: You should use more CX.

IPR: Weigh, don't just extend. Extend Framework.

NR: Respond explicitly to functionality or synergy.
Weighing should be more explicit.

2AR: Weigh extensions against them.

RFO: Neg wins that aff denies agency.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

Watch your language about racial and socio-economic minorities.

AFFIRMATIVE

NFA AS

Aamer Shikari

POINTS
Max = 30
24.5

Pingry AK

Amol Kapoor

POINTS
Max = 30
26.25

The better debating was done by the Neg from Pingry
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AC: FW needs better warrants. What's the impact of equality? It's also mortality, not morality rates. Practice reading your evidence.

You mispronounce - lots of other words too, not just many taxes.

NC: How does the neg solve for taxes? Don't just cross-apply the NC to the AC. Argue against consequentialism. Respond to warrants.

EXC
IAR: Respond to NC FW. Signpost.

NR: Less line by line. More big picture. Extensions need to be more substantive. Weigh.

Why do you keep talking about attack ads? They have nothing to do with anything. You have

2AR: Extend framework or impact to his.

RFD: Neg wins FW. Neg wins impact.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT


Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Collegiate AO	Max = 30	Regis RM	Max = 30
Andrew O'Donohue	<u>29</u>	Ryan McEvoy	<u>28.5</u>

The better debating was done by the Aff from Collegiate AO
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

practice to Phase out the phrase "I would say." It's unnecessary and a time-waster.

The extinction argument - however far-fetched it may be - is given no attention by the Neg, and so b/c this impact essentially precludes all moral theory reasoning or a framework of constitutionality, I err Aff.

The turns on racism/oppression made by Neg were decent - though should be a little more fleshed out - but is negligible compared to extinction of everyone, white/black/or Native Americans.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Collegiate RP Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Austen Rattray ¹

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Seung-Min Park ³

Team: Bronx Science ST Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Kevin Szura ²

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Emily Tagarello ⁴

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Collegiate RP representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

*You're going to need better evidence
Proving the U.S. alliance is bad.
If you keep saying this over and over
but you can't explain why. Alliance
is extremely important in British policy*

Comments to Debaters:

*Johnson card at the bot of Pro
case is awesome! This evidence, showing
the U.S. and China rearmament & strong
militaries keeps in check, really puts an impact
on the Round - Great!*

Reasons

*Not enough evidence to
prove that Malnutrition is the
countries is more important
than diplomacy?*

These are the reasons for my decision:

*Your contention II - lacks about
Foreign Policy leaving America Vulnerable,
this is a great point, it's unique.
You have to have time to get to these points.*

*RP
guar
in deal.*

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 prep time per side

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: C. Bendi

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Stuyvesant UE Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Jakob Urda
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Jonathan Evans

Team: Bronx And/Aha Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Jeremy Andreades
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 29 for Towsif Ahasan

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Bronx And/Aha representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)
Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Need better eye contact and speak a little slower. You should not tell the judge (or trier of fact) what he or she must find or do. Give the judge the facts and arguments and let the judge come to that conclusion

Comments to Debaters:

Good eye contact, excellent flow - arguments were easy to follow and understand

These are the reasons for my decision:

The Pro's arguments were well organized, very clear and were more persuasive. The Con's argued a bit too fast, were not as clear and were not able to ^{effectively} respond to all of the Con's questions and points

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 prep time per side	

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

Ed Bannon (Regis)

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Bronx Science AM Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Xavier Amarille
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Daniel Messner

Team: Byram Hills RB Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 25 for Max Rothschild
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Will Bohrer

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Bronx Science AM representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Both speakers had very good eye contact with the judge + spoke clearly + were well organized. Good job.

Comments to Debaters:

Work on more eye contact with the judge and try to be less dependent on various pages of data. Also, in first round, try not to go so fast - it was hard to follow the argument. Will get better with more experience.

These are the reasons for my decision:

Con was more organized, more persuasive, spoke more clearly and did a good job at responding to the Pro's arguments.

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 prep time per side	

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: Ed Bannon (Regis)

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Regis CO Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27.5 for Jaime Cobham

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Jack O'Malley 173

Team: Bronx Science DK Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Miranda Ditmore 2

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Morry Kolman 4

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Bronx Science DK representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

~~Con extended analogies that~~
the 3 most important points
in the round went in response
to actual

1. Use of weapons by Iran

2. Democracy

the ENTIRE REASON why nations/people
rebel (this was said by pro and was
very accurate and extremely important)
very

These are the reasons for my decision:

3. Syria

• Went put troops in
- find rebels.

you didn't
provide anything
showing that we do not
find rebels, thus I had
to buy on arguments.

Comments to Debaters:

Great job extending Syrian Rebel
argument !! there is a difference b/w
placing troops and funding rebels remains
to be in policy - this turned the PRO
contention II on keeping peace. Well done!

Very well impacting!

great evidence,
this point was
highlighted well

Great Round!
you both were
awesome!

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 prep time per side

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: C. Bendi

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Monticello SH Circle Side: Pro Con
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Emily Smith
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27.5 for Jane Hyman

Team: Bronx Science RS Circle Side: Pro Con
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Michael Raevsky
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Joe Salmaggi

29-30 Outstanding
 27-28 Above Average
 24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Bronx Science RS

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

representing the PRO CON

(Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Joe Effective cross ex. generally solid delivery. Terrific concession obtained in first cross-ex. Detailed economic argument too late to raise in summary -- but not necessary

Comments to Debaters:

Jane Try to avoid speeches during cross ex. Good job of turning back responses into effective questions. Very effective responses on grand cross fire. Especially strong summary!

Michael Strong passionate delivery. Very sharp + facile on cross. Excellent organization and use of concession obtained by your teammate. Conflict between your argument we must keep troops in ME -- and acceptance of our troops breeds terrorism

These are the reasons for my decision:

Serious concessions, harmful to their case, made by both sides. Pro conceded that presence of military in Mid East breeds terrorism while arguing it was wrong to withdraw from there. Con's concession that nukes are greatest threat, and that if Iran gets them, it will supply to terrorists, negates all causation arguments. Con's assertion that simply that we "won't let Iran" get nukes, without analysis or development, and belated (in final focus) argument that Israel will help prevent this, was unconvincing. (Economic arguments a wash)

Emily Good job sticking to your guns on causation point in cross ex. Main speech a bit disjointed and repetitive. Better to address each argument fully and then move on. Point re: Israel raised too late -- in final focus

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 prep time per side

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

John A. Borek Regis/Parent

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Regis HS Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for DuMichel Harley¹

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Sean Sonnemann³

Team: Park RT Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Francisco Ruela⁴

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Mike Tartaglia²

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is

Pro Regis HS

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

representing the PRO CON

(Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

DuMichel - you had the opportunity to ask 5 or 6 questions during crossfire, and I only heard one. Don't share platitudes and make arguments - ask questions!
Both of you: You fell into the debate trap: when listening for key words to build your rebuttals, you missed the meat of your opponents arguments. This lead to a round where you weren't really addressing arguments head on, rather talking past them instead. i.e. Both of you agreeing that Israel is a valuable ally doesn't mean your opponent concedes.

These are the reasons for my decision:

It's a shame this round came down to just nukes in Iran; since it started w/ many more great arguments than that, I really would have liked more discussion on the Humanitarian Aid, Bombs fall on Turkey/Israel and power vacuum arguments. That said, Fran & Mike, Pro proved there is more action on Iran's part in building weapons, and even if unsuccessful, the leverage they get from the threat isn't worth it, and ~~the~~ never touched A) Arms Race B) potential harms from ~~the~~ + power vacuum

Comments to Debaters:

Mike - SLOW DOWN Also, I get your enthusiasm however when you emphasize every single thing you say, the points really emphasis get lost
Sean - slow down too. A lot

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 prep time per side

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

Michelle Hen Hoq

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Lexington BH Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Holden Bruce 2

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Reed Horowitz 4

Team: Bronx Science DP Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Gabriel Delsol 3

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Jimmy Peraffan 1

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is

Lex BH

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

representing the PRO CON

(Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

I think it would help if defined Zionism clearly. Love the ON argument, too bad you didn't exploit it more. Reed-signasty is good & important, but saying "hey, look at this argument, I'll address it later" doesn't count as actually addressing it. It just leaves blank space on my flow waiting to be filled.

Comments to Debaters:

Make sure you are properly pronouncing the names of people you are referencing, ie: Petraeus. Also Jimmy you need to work on word economy. In your summary you repeated yourself several times and had to skip other arguments b/c you ran out of time.

These are the reasons for my decision:

I hate rounds that debaters try to bring down to a technicality. There are so many great arguments on this flow, and you really want to boil it down to whether an action and a policy are the same thing? That's a shame and both sides fell for it. That said, you may me boil it down to the net benefit of our policies, and can now really address how Anti-Americanism is bred, and produced a damn good job of showing how our policies => suicide bombers, recruitment etc.

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 prep time per side

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

Michelle A. Hen Huel

Room: 232

Flight A: Start 6:15

Public Forum Open (Regis AM vs. Monticello MS)

2

Cata, Nicole

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Regis AM Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Danny Apadula

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Matt Melbourne

Team: Monticello MS Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Taylor McCormack

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for William Smith

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Monticello MS

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

representing the PRO CON

(Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

- Try to leave some time in the second speech to extend the arguments made in your case rather than simply addressing your opponents' case.
- Try to link back to national security in your crossfire questions.

Comments to Debaters:

- Great job extending examples and impacts.
- Make sure to challenge any definitions clearly if there is any disagreement.

Both sides: it's nuclear, not nuclear.

These are the reasons for my decision:

I looked to the David evidence about the 85% reduction of terrorism in Palestine and the oil arguments. I fought the argument that the Daily Beast evidence was speculative and therefore weighed the confidence more highly.

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 prep time per side

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: Nicole Cata, Hendrick Hudson

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Bronx Science YS Circle Side: Pro ConSpeaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Victor YeungSpeaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Omair ShahidTeam: Regis HM Circle Side: Pro ConSpeaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Tim HannanSpeaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Vincent Monti

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Bronx Science YS

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

representing the PRO CON

(Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

- Be sure to be prepared with any requested evidence.
- Good job extending key arguments.
- Weigh your arguments!

Comments to Debaters:

- You did a good job asking pointed questions and asking follow-up questions.
- Weigh your arguments!

These are the reasons for my decision:

I used the framework of weighing benefits and harms. That said, this was a very close round. ~~Both sides~~ Con listed several harms and Pro listed several benefits but neither side told me which harms/benefits were the most crucial and why. I consider the Syria arguments to be a wash. I look to the point about diplomacy in Israel, which was the most clearly extended throughout the round.

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: Nicole Cata, Hendrick Hudson

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 prep time per side

which was the most clearly extended throughout the round.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Regis DP Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27.5 for Colin Donnelly 2 1
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Brendan Powell 4 3

Team: Chapin GN Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Alexis Gajwani 2 2
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27.5 for Rebecca Ngu 4 4

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average
22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Regis DP representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Good question in first cross about how increase in attacks locally does not threaten our nat sec.
Brandon... nice, clear, relaxed presentation - nice job.
good logical explanation of why U.S./Iran might deny talks in progress
final focus could use more clarity - good, but not as defined as your crosses + first presentations.

These are the reasons for my decision:

Con had better facts to support claims. Con better prepared and able to refute Pro claims as not really significant -
Pro unable to show clear enough connection to our National Security.

Comments to Debaters:

need to strengthen claims + data to show better connection or link... - how do those increased terrorist attacks affect our security?
Some good logical claims - just research and ask yourself "why + how" this connects to your position.
Develop ideas more thoroughly

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 prep time per side	

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

Alan Devlin
Monticello.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Bronx Science HF Circle Side: Pro Con
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Alon Handler 1
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Adam Freilich 3

Team: Regis LS Circle Side: Pro Con
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Francis Leong 4
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Ferdinand Suba 2

29-30 Outstanding
 27-28 Above Average
 24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Bronx Science representing the PRO CON
 (Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Argument over providing evidence
 + when bordering on unethical...

Got pro to say a few minor
 concessions - such as it is a
 policy that delays Iran getting
 nuclear weapon. positive... "yes"
 good point w/ "how is making
 progress not effective?"

These are the reasons for my decision:

Debate focused heavily on whether sanctions
 are working in Iran or not... conflicting status
 of pro... GDP up, but Con. 80% inflation &
 discontent of populat. It is not Pro's responsibility
 to show counterproposal, but assumption is that
 we can always do better. Crosses + round to Con.

Comments to Debaters:

Watch time management -
 ran over several times.

Well argued + good
 evidence both side.
 would have liked more than
 statement that terrorists are
 exploiting "pallot" date...

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 prep time per side

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

Alan Devlin

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Byram Hills PG Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Matt Percello
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27.5 for Chris Gaetano

Team: Lexington CB Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Diana Cagliero
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26.5 for Dina Benayad-Cherif

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Byram Hills PG representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

- 1st contention is largely unwarranted.
- Contention 2: end war ... but you don't show why this is important for Nat. Sec.
- Contention 3?!? US nuclear policy? you just say U.S. has a lot of nukes...
- Why don't you have Iran blocked out...
- Outdated is not a good response to sug. C.

Comments to Debaters:

- you spend way too much time at top of case.
- Contention 1 sug B is unclear.
- Smiling & nodding & saying definitely is not a good response to the @ if Iran has nuclear capabilities. Make a point here. IOR why your laughing.
- Iran story is a mess... Link
- Iran attacking drone & responsible to cont. 3

These are the reasons for my decision:

Con shows that current US FP in middle east prevents a nuclear Iran & 2. USAID/Contention 1 is conceded by Pro 1/2 way through debate. ARF needs to do a lot more work ... @ best showing US FP is ineffective ... but not detrimental/undermining "our Nat. Sec."

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 prep time per side

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

Matthew M. Brown Science

Room: 211

Flight A: Start 6:15

Public Forum Open (Stuyvesant CC vs. Bronx Science AA)

2

Leszczynski, Pau

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Stuyvesant CC Circle Side: Pro Con 2
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Jack Cahn
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for David Cahn

Team: Bronx Science AA Circle Side: Pro Con 1
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Elena Anderson
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Margarita Artoglou

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is

STUYVESANT CC
(Team Name for the Winning Team)

representing the PRO CON

(Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

you HAVE A LOT
of disingenuous
arguments that we
all know are false
your arguments are contradictory

Comments to Debaters:

Don't let them walk
all over you during the
crossfires.

THink of their arguments
more conceptually

These are the reasons for my decision:

VOTING ON ISRAEL
ORAL CRITIQUE

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 prep time per side

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

Pau Leszczynski

HEN HUD

Room: 211

Flight B: Start 6:50ish

Public Forum Open (Byram Hills KB vs. Regis JR)

2

Leszczynski, Pau

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Byram Hills KB Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u> <u>1</u> <u>59</u> Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Ava Kingsley Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Jon Bohrer	Team: Regis JR Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u> <u>2</u> <u>1:18</u> Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>29</u> for Tom Jaklitsch Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>29</u> for Patrick Rice
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Regis JR representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

You should attack polling data better

You got a little too bogged down

Comments to Debaters:

You lied about your polling data w/ IRAN

Pakistan and Drone Strikes are two powerful topics that you define yourself out of

IF YOU'RE GOING TO DEFINE ARGUMENTS OUT, DON'T WASTE TIME ATTACKING IT

These are the reasons for my decision:

ORALJ Vote on Syria

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 prep time per side

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

Paul Leszczynski Hendrick Hudson HS

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Regis PP Circle Side: <u>Pro</u> Con	Team: Collegiate PW Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28.5</u> for Christian Pavlakos 3	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28.5</u> for Joshua Podolsky 2
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>29</u> for Alex Petrillo 1	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28.5</u> for Charlie Windolf 4

29-30 Outstanding	22-23 Below Average
27-28 Above Average	
24-26 Average	

The team that won this debate is Regis PP representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Very well debated by all. The flow went to pro on the issue of Iran (i.e., sanctions not doing enough). I needed more evidence from con about that, in rebuttal, but also you could have extended your own contention on economic impacts to Iran's currency.

Also, con should answer the point that drone strikes

These are the reasons for my decision:

increase anti-American sentiment.

Comments to Debaters:

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 prep time per side	

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

John Karl Urda / Stuyvesant HS

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Stuyvesant LK Circle Side: Pro Con -1:40
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27.5 for Zachary Lemonides 3
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Ben Kessler 1

Team: Regis BP Circle Side: Pro Con 2nd -1:20
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26.5 for Eddie Bannon 2 :40
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26.5 for Christian Powers 4

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Stuyvesant LK representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)
Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

- Don't ask your opponent to answer your dollar heg contention in the crossfire... If you're out of questions, let your opponent one.
- Please give me the dollar heg impact in your case. And explain it - don't just tell me that it's important.
- No need for the drama - point out the contradiction and move on.

These are the reasons for my decision:

Foreign Policies that aren't as effective as we'd like don't automatically make that policy a threat to U.S. national security. Pro needed to do more to show me that not only are sanctions 'ineffective', they also have an additional negative effect to U.S. national security. The only threat is the Iranian nuclear policy. Also, Pro needed a more substantive answer to terrorism.

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: Bronx science

Comments to Debaters:

- Don't contradict your framework. Afg and Pak are in Greater Middle East... as you said in your case.
- need a ~~better~~ link between anti-american sentiment and nat'l security threats. Anything will do.
- please don't bother with trying to avoid addressing Afghanistan as a part of the middle east... attack that point directly.

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 prep time per side

and drone strikes in order to win that point. As for Syria, both teams needed to give me specifics as to what we were actually doing / should have done. I voted on terrorism ↓.