

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO		
Spkr	Hackley BF	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Matthew Bonanno	28
3	Owen Friesen	28

CON		
Spkr	Stuyvesant BP	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Emma Bernstein	27.5
4	Inbar Pe'er	27.5

Winner: Hackley BF School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Eric R. Olson School: Regis

Other judges on panel: Brian Campbell. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Hackley - Strong case (esp. china sec. points) and good logical flow. Not sure the analogy to Iraq is appropriate given the vastly diff. context. Good reinforcement of sex. ass. argument.

Stuy - I know laptops are allowed, but holding it during your speech ~~impedes~~ impedes your ~~delivery~~ delivery unnecessarily. Consider putting down or printing your case. Nice rebuttal and signposting.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

- Speaker 1 (Team 1) 4
- Speaker 2 (Team 2) 4
- Cross-Ex 3
- Speaker 3 (Team 1) 4
- Speaker 4 (Team 2) 4
- Cross-ex 3
- Speaker 1 Summary 2
- Speaker 2 Summary 2
- Grand Cross-ex (all 4) 3
- Speaker 3 Final Focus 2
- Speaker 4 Final Focus 2
- Prep Time (each team) 2

← Look forward during CF

RFD: Debate seemed to circle around U.S. military interests vs. a multitude of negative side effects. Ultimately, I think the Pro did a convincing job showing that the neg. consequences of closure are not that bad.

Overall, a very good round that was close. Thank you.

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO		
Spkr	School/Team	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Byram Hills UY	28.5
3	Kyle Unger	
1	Sabrina You	

CON		
Spkr	School/Team	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Regis JL	28
2	Kyle Jones	
4	TJ Li	

Winner: Byram Hills UY debating on the Pro
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: J. Blossom School: Hackley

Other judges on panel: John Urda. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Excellent speaking and clarity from all debaters. Regis Realpolitik is consistent and focused, but the US-China scenario is followed by Pro's de-escalation premises. Good clash on the's political capital, but I lean Pro here, too. The base/trade \$ trade-off leans pro, though I wish pro ran further w/ military spending by US - could have attacked Regis' implied frameworks there. Reactive/proactive Pro material compelling, though I understand the con's works here - you do need the military in disasters at times... why not Japan's? And China's? Better regulation/cooperation to Pro. 3 no/225 no cards help pro too.

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Regis AA	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Jack Aiello	27
3	Andrew Aoyama	27

CON

Spkr	Stuyvesant GJ	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Zachary Ginsberg	28
2	Daniel Ju	28

Winner: Stuy GJ School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Hackley

Other judges on panel: Barbara Pascale-Blossom. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Jack - don't dominate cross. Be sure the other side has a chance to respond. And answer the question outright & then stop talking.
 Zachary - great job responding to Q's in crossfire - esp. grand cross.
 Andrew - you could be politer in cross to - don't cut him off when he is answering you question
 - also - don't ask a Q and when he responds explain that the subject of the answer isn't a ~~major~~ issue in the round
 RED - This was a close round - both teams did a good job covering the flow. The issue of that their arguments aren't a reason to vote pro; just a reason to use other deterrents as well should have been an overview. I buy that we can have benefits of pro word (ie treaties) + also have military presence incl. Also - I don't think pro doesn't do enough on Rice + NYT cards - so I buy con impacts that presence at least has a deterrence effect + may decrease rate of conflict.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand-Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO			
Spkr	Regis AA		POINTS (0-30)
1	Jack Aiello	90 28.5	
3	Andrew Aoyama	29.5	

CON			
Spkr	Stuyvesant GJ		POINTS (0-30)
4	Zachary Ginsberg	88 29	
2	Daniel Ju	28.5	

Winner: Regis AA debating on the Pro
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Hackley

Other judges on panel: Andrea Gellen. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: Round boils down to what motivates Chinese aggression in region.

Pro does a good job explaining warrant for Okinawa presence => ↑ aggression, perception of Western imperialism, trade routes etc. fact that Ch. aggression in S. Islands happened despite Okinawa presence. Ev is not specific to Okinawa, ~~but~~ ^{and some} can ev ~~that~~ is specific, but ultimately Con doesn't effectively answer this warrant, ~~ultimately~~ just kind of restating US presence is a deterrent, China will become aggressive, etc. Even if Stratford is non-unique, by Con's logic of "2 deterrents better than 1" some reduction in unnecessary ^{is} unhelpful military presence in region is better than ~~none~~.

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO		
Spkr	Regis BC	POINTS (0-30)
	Andrew Bigelow	28
	Jordan Campbell	

CON		
Spkr	Hackley WT	POINTS (0-30)
	Connor Wilke	28.5
	Seth Tilliss	

Winner: Hackley WT debating on the CON
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Stuyvesant

Other judges on panel: Zach Frieden. Please do not start until all judges are present.

WEIGHT
 your arguments!!!

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I vote ~~PRO~~ CON on conflict and Aid,
 3 issues:

but I also think that
 the PRO doesn't respond
 to the CON team's
 arguments about how
 something is better than
 having. I wish PRO
 had developed more of
 their better offensive
 arguments about buffer
 zones and diplomatic relations

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

1. Okinawan Autonomy
 PRO extends this argument,
 but ~~doesn't~~ they don't respond
 to the con team's responses, and
 they don't explain why this
 matters

2. Conflict
 I believe the PRO proves
 their points about US troop presence
 being a poor deterrent and the US
~~is already~~ treaty already allow for
 a strong enough security guarantee,

3. Aid
 The PRO teams only
 response to this argument
 is that we can put troops
 other places, but they never address the
 claim and evidence that says
 Okinawa is ~~the~~ the best place
 in the world

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Hackley BF	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Matthew Bonanno <i>8.8</i>	<i>28.5</i>
2	Owen Friesen	<i>29</i>

CON

Spkr	Stuyvesant BP	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Emma Bernstein <i>8.3</i>	<i>28.5</i>
2	Inbar Pe'er	<i>28</i>

Winner: *Hackley* debating on the *Pro*
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: *Brian Campbell* School: *REGIS*

Other judges on panel: Eric Olson. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision: *Pro did a better job of refuting CON'S intentions than advocating their own case. Issue of credibility of deterrence and safety and humanitarian aid all were well made.*

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

- Speaker 1 (Team 1) 4
- Speaker 2 (Team 2) 4
- Cross-Ex 3
- Speaker 3 (Team 1) 4
- Speaker 4 (Team 2) 4
- Cross-ex 3
- Speaker 1 Summary 2
- Speaker 2 Summary 2
- Grand Cross-ex (all 4) 3
- Speaker 3 Final Focus 2
- Speaker 4 Final Focus 2
- Prep Time (each team) 2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Stuyvesant AR	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Shaik Abiden	27
	Abie Rohrig	

CON

Spkr	Hackley SF	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Neil Suri	28
	Karina Franke	

Winner: HACKLEY SF debating on the CON
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: REGIS

Other judges on panel: Alex Rybchuk. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

PRO - YOUR ARGUMENTS WERE
 CONFUSING

CON -

SPK 2 - GOOD FINAL FOCUS, WON
 THE ~~ROUND~~ ROUND
 MORE

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

REF. - THE CON'S DETERMINATION ARGUMENT
 WAS MUCH STRONGER THAN THE PRO'S. ALSO,
 THE ^{CON'S} RE-MILITARIZATION OF JAPAN CONTENTION
 WAS WELL PRESENTED AND NOT FULLY
 ADDRESSED BY THE PRO.

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Stuyvesant AR	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Shaik Abiden	26
3	Abie Rohrig	28

Team Points 27

CON

Spkr	Hackley SF	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Neil Suri	27.5
4	Karina Franke	27.5

Team Points 27.5

Winner: Hackley SF School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Alex Rybchuk School: Regis HS

Other judges on panel: Andy Aoyama. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Disappointed over KE I
- Pro: If sustained, but framework in case
- Japan's
- Con clearly won on humanitarian point
 - Aid to rest of East Asia
 - Lives have already been saved, maybe not 400k, but some.
- Japanese military capability increasing in status quo. Their
- Japan 'legitimate actor' status of Japan does not depend
- On US presence => Con wins on aggression

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO			POINTS
Spkr	School/Team		(0 - 30)
	Byram Hills UY	29	
3	Kyle Unger		
1	Sabrina You		

CON			POINTS
Spkr	School/Team		(0 - 30)
	Regis JL	28	
2	Kyle Jones		
4	TJ Li		

Winner: Byram Hills UY School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Stuyvesant

Other judges on panel: Jackson Blossom. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

With "lives saved" as the agreed framework, my voters are deterrence and humanitarian aid impact.
 On deterrence, Pro's 225% evidence of increased chance of conflict and that a shift of the burden to Japan would have the same effect were more persuasive.

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

On humanitarian aid, pro prevailed on multiple evidence: military pulls \$ away from aid, aid is cheaper and better when done by groups, military is reactive to crises.

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

Please cite ~~your~~ your evidence in summary and FF.

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Regis BC	POINTS (0-30)
	Andrew Bigelow	29
	Jordan Campbell	25

CON

Spkr	Hackley WT	POINTS (0-30)
	Connor Wilke	28
	Seth Tilliss	28

Winner: Regis BC School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Byram Hills

Other judges on panel: Ben Kessler. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Context

Hackley based argument on "undermine legitimacy of agreement" + "shuttle"
 Regis war his argument, claiming consistency but troops still present on J-flu, not undermining agreement just moving towards independence.

Defense

Regis kept bringing up examples of China aggression, lack of respect for boundaries Hackley ^{seriously} responded w/ withdrawing and questioning current aggression → well it appears as if Chinese aggression has already been limited, regardless of defense. R: "No problem OK troops"

Arms Race

Argument is a catch. H: "There will be an arms race" R: "never in the world". No one wins the point

Public Opinion - no writing, 2 diff cards, no one wins

Arg - H could have really attacked core issues.

I voted on context + no alternative

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

- Speaker 1 (Team 1) 4
- Speaker 2 (Team 2) 4
- Cross-Ex 3
- Speaker 3 (Team 1) 4
- Speaker 4 (Team 2) 4
- Cross-ex 3
- Speaker 1 Summary 2
- Speaker 2 Summary 2
- Grand Cross-ex (all 4) 3
- Speaker 3 Final Focus 2
- Speaker 4 Final Focus 2
- Prep Time (each team) 2

and I say the PRO argument about wanting to ensure they have to militarize
 better than 2 countries are

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Hackley WT	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Connor Wilke	28.5
	Seth Tilliss	

CON

Spkr	Regis AA	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Jack Aiello	28
	Andrew Aoyama	

Winner: Hackley WT School/Team debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Stuyvesant

Other judges on panel: Rose Joyce-Turner. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This round was very close and hard to decide
 I ultimately vote PRO on conflict.

2 issues:

2. Conflict

1. Okinawa oppression
 CON's response about local citizens committing more crime takes this out.

All rapes get reported at low rates, you don't show uniqueness to these cases.

The ~~PRO~~ CON goes for stuff about a symbolic presence and showing we aren't weak. However, you don't address the responses about how China would never us even if we tripled strength and how we're not going to be perceived as weak because we're building up elsewhere.

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1) 4
Speaker 2 (Team 2) 4
Cross-Ex 3
Speaker 3 (Team 1) 4
Speaker 4 (Team 2) 4
Cross-ex 3
Speaker 1 Summary 2
Speaker 2 Summary 2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4) 3
Speaker 3 Final Focus 2
Speaker 4 Final Focus 2
Prep Time (each team) 2

The PRO goes for ~~PRO~~ Japanese militarization. Though we see this happening in the same exact, and I say the PRO argument about wanting to ensure they have to militarize

The con says militarization happens in both worlds, I don't see

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Regis JL	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Kyle Jones	27.5
3	TJ Li	27.5

CON

Spkr	Stuyvesant AR	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Shaik Abiden	28
4	Abie Rohrig	28

Winner: Stuy AR debating on the Con
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Hackley

Other judges on panel: Zach Frieden. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

TJ & Abie - try not to talk over each other.
 TJ - you extend through me a few times in final focus. You say "they never responded to this" and they did.
 I vote off of the con offense that is the only offense remaining at end of round. Pro doesn't respond to con's statement that ballistic missiles haven't happened before & won't happen if US is there b/c no one wants to start with US, or that they won't be able to respond to natural disasters as quickly from Guam. I vote off the natural disaster argument - Pro says they don't provide impact or evidence for how much of a difference it makes having troops in Okinawa, but con can say that they respond faster, and that just a few hours makes a difference, and that their response saves thousands of lives.

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Stuyvesant GJ	POINTS (0 - 30)
3	Zachary Ginsberg	29
1	Daniel Ju	28

CON

Spkr	Hackley BF	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Matthew Bonanno	27
4	Owen Friesen	27

Team 28.5 Team: 27

Winner: STUYVESANT GJ debating on the Pro
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Alex Rybchuk School: Regis HS

Other judges on panel: Andy Aoyama. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- XFI: Pro - I liked the newspaper analogy
- Con: You should know if Taiwan is stationing troops
- Pro wins humanitarian
- Con: I wish you pressed pro more on the double bind
- Both: Some sort of framework establishing ~~the~~ how important deterrence is. ~~In the end~~, This debate doesn't really have 'lives' as a weight metric, so you need to set up another method to weigh

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT
 Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Stuyvesant BP	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Emma Bernstein	28
3	Inbar Pe'er	27.5

CON

Spkr	Byram Hills UY	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Kyle Unger	28.5
2	Sabrina You	29

Winner: Byram Hills UY School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Keelan Pascale-Blossom School: Hackley

Other judges on panel: James Lassen. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

A lot of time spent on humanitarian aid & /ves - this goes on since pro can't really show me that Japan is capable of taking this on - may be evidence at there, but is a reason to keep base. I'm reluctant to vote on this since I think con's argument is actually contradictory - it's spillaer when the US military gives human. assistance, yet if Japanese militarization would take \$ away from humanitarian aid for its citizens? But Pro doesn't take this on. Re deterrence - I buy con's argument that spreading it isn't necessary to protect US (China won't bomb) while there is ↑ risk of aggression if US leaves.

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Hackley WT	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Connor Wilke	
	Seth Tilliss	28

CON

Spkr	Regis AA	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Jack Aiello	
	Andrew Aoyama	29

Winner: Regis AA School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Monticello

Other judges on panel: Peter Ju. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*Accounting of accounts Prep time is really abusive on Pro side
 or math skills need attention*

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Stuyvesant BP	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Emma Bernstein	27.5
	Inbar Pe'er	

CON

Spkr	Byram Hills UY	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Kyle Unger	28
	Sabrina You	

Winner: Byram Hills UY School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Regis

Other judges on panel: Barbara Pascale-Blossom. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

BH: Contingency planning analyses don't center around China "bombing" the United States or Japan. Your rhetoric should reflect the complexity of militaristic tensions in the Asia-Pacific.
 (FOU, E+S China Secs, Nat Resur, etc.)

Stuy: Be careful of repeatedly confusing China w/ Japan.

Con was on rebuttal to cost effectiveness pt., on political infeasibility of relocation, and unlikelihood of China's going to war w/ the United States.

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1) 4
Speaker 2 (Team 2) 4
Cross-Ex 3
Speaker 3 (Team 1) 4
Speaker 4 (Team 2) 4
Cross-ex 3
Speaker 1 Summary 2
Speaker 2 Summary 2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4) 3
Speaker 3 Final Focus 2
Speaker 4 Final Focus 2
Prep Time (each team) 2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Regis JL	POINTS (0-30)
1	Kyle Jones	28.5
3	TJ Li	28.5

CON

Spkr	Stuyvesant AR	POINTS (0-30)
2	Shaik Abiden	29
4	Abie Rohrig	29

Winner: Stuyvesant AR debating on the CON
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Byram Hills

Other judges on panel: Andrea Gellen. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*FW: 1-look 2 US => I dont buy this, con wins lines
 2- move to Guam => con provides 2012 example, pro doesnt respond, con wins
 that US will NOT move to Guam. Pro's main argument doesnt
 make sense and is rebutted well by con.*

Disasters

*pro main arg is that we'll move to Guam when will a disaster. Problem is
 that on ~~the~~ Guam, we want move there, so con wins this. Con also
 gives 100,000 and, which pro doesnt respond to. Using FW, this has point
 a very important.*

Remilitarization

*pro The entire ~~potential~~ aspect of remil goes to pro. Political will for remil
 is going to increase if US moves out. However, the knowledge/training point I
 give to con. My reasoning for this is if the US pulls 1/2 of its troops out, ~~then~~ the
 coast/mountain troops still train, yes, but not to the degree that they could have
 with war troops as an establishment. So, even if remilitarization was
 increased when US moves out, training would be, so this argument kinda stagnates.
 As such, this point is given to pro as an example of why US should stay*

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

In the end, I voted based off Guam FW (when ~~the~~ into disasters) and the remil training point.

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Hackley SF	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Neil Suri	28
2	Karina Franke	28.5

CON

Spkr	Regis BC	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Andrew Bigelow	27.5
1	Jordan Campbell	27.5

Winner: Hackley SF debating on the Pro
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Stuyvesant

Other judges on panel: John Urda. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both teams agree that there are 2 important issues, stability & what the host nation wants. They disagree on whether both of these things are ^{equally} important. At the end of the day, I'm left not sure if they are but it ends up not mattering for my decision.

In terms of stability, Hackley wins the argument that the presence of the bases leads to an aggression from China, but even if the con wins that it's the absence of the troops that matters & leads to aggression. Aff still wins that the troops in Okinawa aren't effective in the first place & there are other alternatives.

In terms of what the host nation wants (just by what off says that it's probably bad if the people in Japan don't want the base there & that the absence of the troops would reduce the issues on hand & other alternate methods of disarmament exist.

Because of this I vote for Aff

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Hackley SF	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Neil Suri	
3	Karina Franke	

CON

Spkr	Regis BC	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Andrew Bigelow	
2	Jordan Campbell	

Winner: Hackley SF debating on the Pro
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: John Urda School: Stuyvesant

Other judges on panel: Saif Zihiri. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I agree with Pro that both security and local interests should be weighed in the round. Pro clearly wins local interests. Con's rebuttal, that the harms are non-unique, assumes that Japanese forces would step in to the same base, in the same role, w/out evidence. Security is a closer call. I don't see a clear winner here, so the round goes to Pro.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

- Speaker 1 (Team 1) 4
- Speaker 2 (Team 2) 4
- Cross-Ex 3
- Speaker 3 (Team 1) 4
- Speaker 4 (Team 2) 4
- Cross-ex 3
- Speaker 1 Summary 2
- Speaker 2 Summary 2
- Grand Cross-ex (all 4) 3
- Speaker 3 Final Focus 2
- Speaker 4 Final Focus 2
- Prep Time (each team) 2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Stuyvesant GJ	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Zachary Ginsberg	27
1	Daniel Ju	

CON

Spkr	Hackley BF	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Matthew Bonanno	28
	Owen Friesen	

Winner: HACKLEY BF debating on the CON
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: ROGS

Other judges on panel: Alex Rybchuk. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: THE CON'S CONTENTIONS WENT LARGELY UNADDRESSED BY BY THE PRO. THE CON'S FIRST ~~AND~~ CONTENTIONS ("NUCLEAR JAPAN") AND THIRD CONTENTION ("PROVIDING HUMANITARIAN RELIEF") WERE NOT ~~ADDRESSED~~ ADDRESSED ADEQUATELY

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Byram Hills UY	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Kyle Unger	28.5
1	Sabrina You	28.5

CON

Spkr	Hackley SF	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Neil Suri	28
2	Karina Franke	28

Winner: Byram Hills UY debating on the Pro
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signatures] School: Stuyvesant HS

Other judges on panel: Andy Aoyama. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

There are two main arguments both sides go for, deterrence & humanitarian aid. For deterrence I buy the Aff's argument that pulling the troops will first, increase political capital enough that Japan won't just sit there without an army & that China will be ~~more~~ more deterred with a strong Japanese army. I also buy that in the states quo deterrence isn't working & I don't buy that the US will be seen as just leaving Japan's horns the alliance by the Con. Humanitarian aid argument is said to be the most important issue in the round but there's no real war root for that so I buy the ~~Con's~~ ^{Pro's} argument that ~~but I do buy that~~ ^{but I do buy that} the best suited area for us to see lines ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~more~~ ^{more} the horns of from military that the Con read evidence also not totally related so that ~~weakens their~~ that the aid will be harmed & is less eff

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Regis AA	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Jack Aiello	
3	Andrew Aoyama	

CON

Spkr	Hackley BF	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Matthew Bonanno	
4	Owen Friesen	

Winner: Hackley BF debating on the Con
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Stuyvesant

Other judges on panel: Zach Frieden. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The round came down to the US-Japan Treaty, and Humanitarian Aid. No one gave me a weighing mechanism. On the treaty, I tend to go with pro - the treaty is a deterrent to Chinese aggression even if Con's point is true, that a withdrawal would alter China's perception. But it's close. On humanitarian aid, Pro's rebuttal, that there are troops all around the region, is not enough to overcome the central location of Okinawa and the special training of troops there. Pro needs to give better evidence that troops based elsewhere have been/could be just as responsive. That one was not so close, so the round goes to Con.

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT
 Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Stuyvesant BP	POINTS (0-30)
1	Emma Bernstein	28
3	Inbar Pe'er	28

CON

Spkr	Regis JL	POINTS (0-30)
2	Kyle Jones	29
4	TJ Li	29.5

Winner: Regis JL School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Pascale-Blossom School: Hackley

*Please chair this round. Other judges on panel: Andrea Gellen. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

FW goes on w/c pro doesn't contest resolution is 3rd actor, not "in US interests"
 Pro case depends heavily on ↑ Japanese militarism being good for security, and the idea that ^{US} troops will be dispersed from Okinawa in a manner that ~~results~~ results in benefits to humanitarian aid (modernization). There are lots of "ifs" in pro's case that require ev of probability, as con points out - evidence is that relocating could ⇒ ↑ modernization, which logically could help aid efforts, but right now pro's ev that Okinawa base ~~is~~ has saved so many lives of w's given lack of probability (incl. probability that troops will be moved to the other places - (which? How inevitable is this?). The nuclear umbrella ~~is~~ arg from pro carries some weight, but con's ev & args are persuasive that China would likely perceive withdrawal as weakness of US resolve & be more willing to attack.

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

Voices on mostly humanitarian aid, though deterrence mostly goes on as well.

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Hackley WT	POINTS (0 - 30)
23	Connor Wilke	28
1	Seth Tilliss	28

CON

Spkr	Stuyvesant GJ	POINTS (0 - 30)
34	Zachary Ginsberg	27
42	Daniel Ju	27

Winner: Hackley WT School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Eric R. Olson School: Regis

*Please chair this round. Other judges on panel: James Lassen. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both teams agreed that the voting issues in this round were the effect of the base closure on conflict resolution and aid delivery. The Pro team brought up compelling evidence that there is a large military presence outside the base (80,000 troops) enabling the U.S. to mitigate any negative effects of closure. Con - you had evidence contradicting this in your case but dropped it in your rebuttals so I'm forced to vote Pro.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

- Speaker 1 (Team 1) 4
- Speaker 2 (Team 2) 4
- Cross-Ex 3
- Speaker 3 (Team 1) 4
- Speaker 4 (Team 2) 4
- Cross-ex 3
- Speaker 1 Summary 2
- Speaker 2 Summary 2
- Grand Cross-ex (all 4) 3
- Speaker 3 Final Focus 2
- Speaker 4 Final Focus 2
- Prep Time (each team) 2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Hackley WT	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Connor Wilke	27.5
	Seth Tilliss	

CON

Spkr	Stuyvesant GJ	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Zachary Ginsberg	28.5
	Daniel Ju	

Winner: Stuyvesant GJ debating on the CON
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: James Lassen School: Regis

Other judges on panel: Eric Olson. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Hackley: Whether the DPRK actually successfully tested an H-bomb is debated + most agree is unlikely.
 I forget who said this, but "guise" is pronounced "guys," not "geeze."
Hackley: You should know the specifics of the RAND rapid-response myth paper.
Hackley: good comparison of Japan's relative ability to militarize vs. Philippines or Vietnam. Be able to respond to the know-how point.
 CON wins on crime, comparative analysis, + strategize, importance of Okinawa.

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Stuyvesant BP	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Emma Bernstein	27
3	Inbar Pe'er	27

CON

Spkr	Regis JL	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Kyle Jones	27.5
4	TJ Li	27.5

Winner: Regis JL debating on the Con
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Hackley

Other judges on panel: Barbara Pascale-Blossom. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I vote con b/c there is some offense that goes unresponded to while con totally addresses the pro offense. Concerning pro offense, con points out that troops don't need to move to modernize, they can just do that anywhere. They explain that the location is strategic & if they move they will be less able to help people. Additionally, concerns deterrence China, con argument that when US removed it self from Philippines China invaded goes unresponded to. On con: I could vote solely off hum. aid issue: even if Red Cross could do work, they need manna to get there. This is an impact directly linked to saving lives. Also - I don't buy that only US lives matter b/c it isn't supported by res & is inconsistent w/ pro case, which does mention non US lives. It is clear that both sides value all lives.

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Regis BC <i>BA</i>	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Andrew Bigelow	27.5
3	Jordan Campbell	27.5

CON

Spkr	Stuyvesant AR <i>.7 .45</i>	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Shaik Abiden	28
4	Abie Rohrig	28

Winner: Stuy AR debating on the Con
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Hackley

Other judges on panel: Jackson Blossom. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I vote off of con offense. Ultimately, a lot of pro offense lacks impacts. Why do we care if the Okinawa people lose some autonomy. Con gives me meaningful weighing mechanisms (ie lives: who saves the most of them?). ~~Spitzer~~ I vote off Spitzer card which goes unresponded to - they can't build up a military presence w/o US assistance. I agree that cons quote from the military chief head that presence serves "no function" adds no weight - that's just a quote give me ~~arguments~~ ^{evidence} or evidence. Argument about how it still takes weeks to mobilize is defense not offense.

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	8
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Regis AA	POINTS (0-30)
1	Jack Aiello	28
3	Andrew Aoyama	28

CON

Spkr	Hackley BF	POINTS (0-30)
2	Matthew Bonanno	28.5
4	Owen Friesen	28.5

Winner: Hackley BF debating on the CON
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Byram Hills

*Please chair this round. Other judges on panel: John Urda. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aid: I agree Aid to Con. While yes, there are troops elsewhere, ok names are specifically framed to deal w/ Aid. ~~Pro doesn't~~ Pro does not respond to look lines. Con is strategically placed and pro doesn't respond to look lines. Con.

Motives: Evidence regarding plane-ups does show that there are still plane-ups in the region. Motives are not completely obvious. With the self-made islands, ~~without that~~ through that they may still be possessed by Japan, there were plane-ups, I agree this to con.

Treaty: Pro continues to claim treaty does everything. However, pro never responds to undermining it treaty given us withdrawal from ac. While it may have been effective @ some points, the plane-ups undermine the treaty evidence, ~~and an overall~~ OK withdrawal would mean the treaty.

Future: In regards to the treaty, I side w/ con. Unlikely to expansionist, if we withdraw ok, it will give china a good part the region is open. I doubt long term Pro's "Evil" argument, and pro agreed that C wants to be a hegemon, thus leading support to the ↑ C arg only.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)4
Cross-Ex3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)4
Cross-ex3
Speaker 1 Summary2
Speaker 2 Summary2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)3
Speaker 3 Final Focus2
Speaker 4 Final Focus2
Prep Time (each team)2

I found this round to be very muddled. In the end, I voted off the Chinese Aggression Arg and the ~~self-made~~ self-made islands argument from the con.
(I voted w/ to a 20)

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Regis BC	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Andrew Bigelow	
3	Jordan Campbell	

CON

Spkr	Stuyvesant AR	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Shaik Abiden	
4	Abie Rohrig	

Winner: Regis BC debating on the Pro
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: J. Blossom School: Hackley

*Please chair this round. Other judges on panel: Andrea Gellen. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Stuy CON posits WWII and doom - feels extreme and sources don't convey as much in my ears. Japan needs our knowledge?? B/C the NYTimes says so? Feels flat. Equidistance + proximity to more of the pacific w/ disasters + 28 so conflict card are important points, but Pro makes or engages these. ↑ Regional responsibility. O. self determination (not abstract, stuy), and 1960 treaty all to Regis/Pro. Regis/Pro control all crosses, and seem to be more connected w/ reality, conceptually + w/ current events. Stuy debates well, but misses marks.

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

↑ trap? turn attempt by stuy interesting - but crimes + 80k troops in Okinawa

Counter for Pro

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Byram Hills UY	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Kyle Unger	27
↓	Sabrina You	27.5

CON

Spkr	Hackley SF	POINTS (0 - 30)
↓	Neil Suri	28
	Karina Franke	

Winner: Hackley SF debating on the CON
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Regis

*Please chair this round. Other judges on panel: Saif Zihiri. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

REF - THE CON'S FIRST AND THIRD CONTENTIONS
 (DIATER CHINESE AGGRESSION; LOCATION BEST SUITED
 FOR HUMANITARIAN AID/RELIEF) WERE NOT ADEQUATELY
 ADDRESSED BY THE PRO.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

- Speaker 1 (Team 1) 4
- Speaker 2 (Team 2) 4
- Cross-Ex 3
- Speaker 3 (Team 1) 4
- Speaker 4 (Team 2) 4
- Cross-ex 3
- Speaker 1 Summary 2
- Speaker 2 Summary 2
- Grand Cross-ex (all 4) 3
- Speaker 3 Final Focus 2
- Speaker 4 Final Focus 2
- Prep Time (each team) 2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Regis JL	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Kyle Jones	28.5
	TJ Li	28.5

CON

Spkr	Hackley WT	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Connor Wilke	27.5
	Seth Tilliss	27.5

Winner: Regis JL debating on the Pro
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: School: Stuyvesant

*Please chair this round. Other judges on panel: Ben Kessler. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The framework of the round is based on 2 things humanitarian interest of and U.S. interest, I buy that the U.S. interest point of view is the more necessary one which makes it so that I also buy the Pro's relational argument on Guam & its effectiveness as a base, which the Con team did not respond to. I can vote on pro simple on that.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

- Speaker 1 (Team 1) 4
- Speaker 2 (Team 2) 4
- Cross-Ex 3
- Speaker 3 (Team 1) 4
- Speaker 4 (Team 2) 4
- Cross-ex 3
- Speaker 1 Summary 2
- Speaker 2 Summary 2
- Grand Cross-ex (all 4) 3
- Speaker 3 Final Focus 2
- Speaker 4 Final Focus 2
- Prep Time (each team) 2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Stuyvesant AR	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Shaik Abiden	} 28
	Abie Rohrig	

CON

Spkr	Regis AA	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Jack Aiello	} 29
	Andrew Aoyama	

Winner: Regis AA debating on the Con
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: J. Derek Rahman School: Iona Preparatory

Other judges on panel: Barbara Pascale-Blossom. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Stuy's concentration argument not made

Pro: - If you say, we will still have troops in Japan post Okinawa withdrawal, that argues against your argument that Japan will be spurred to up its capability to defend itself.

- Con argument that Japan is already building its military + developing alliances under Ake + US acting as a "conductor" was not effectively refuted

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

Pro

- Japan is dev military ~~not~~ ~~not~~ ~~not~~
- would be premature

- being facilitated in A21-lateral talks today

- dev Japan military
 - sustainable
 - better defend Japan for Japan
- forces alliances to be dev by Japan (vs. China)
- US base antagonistic China
 - no trust
 - ↑ threat to US
- moving forces to better places (rotation)
 - forces become resilient; less vulnerable to attack since rotating

Con

- need assurance + deterrence
 - location strategic
 - stronger posture (forward)
 - rebalancing tried & failed
 - S. China Sea dominated by China
↳ no US presence
- x 2. US works w/ allies
- x 3. needed to respond to natural disasters
↳ hours to months?

→ withdraw [not decrease] presence

→ if you say, we still have troops in Japan post w/draw, then how can you say Japan will be spurred to ↑ its military

→ don't believe concentration argument

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT
 Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Stuyvesant AR	POINTS (0-30)
1	Shaik Abiden	28.5
3	Abie Rohrig	28.5

CON

Spkr	Regis AA	POINTS (0-30)
4	Jack Aiello	28.5
2	Andrew Aoyama	29

28.8

Winner: Regis AA debating on the Con
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Pascale Blossom School: Hackley

*Please chair this round. Other judges on panel: Mr. Rahman. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Close round! RFD:

What seems to be missing from this round is framework re timeline of withdrawal. Con is arguing we shouldn't pull out all troops at once - Pro is implicitly conceding this FW and didn't have to - and the round might have gone PRO if they took this on! (Pro argues long-term key but doesn't contest sudden withdrawal of all troops)

Not persuaded by better response w/ dispersion, esp. if Chinese citizens are concerned about presence throughout region (not Okinawa specific)

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

The Philippines vs. Afghan war examples were argued well, I mostly buy con's argument here that the Philippines argument is more relevant b/c of what it signifies in terms of ^{Chinese} perception. In SQ Japan is slowly militarizing - pro seems to be saying they need a jolt into immediate, ~~mostly~~ ↑ militarization, but why this ~~could~~ would lead to ↑ security over the SQ is not clear. Con argues "training wheel" argument effectively (same with US involvement w/ treaties, coalitions).

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

Voting can on debater's argument effectively

Humanitarian aid mostly dropped, ~~same~~ a noisy, same goes can (outside Japan).

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Regis JL	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Kyle Jones	29
	TJ Li	

CON

Spkr	Hackley WT	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Connor Wilke	28
	Seth Tilliss	

Winner: Regis JL debating on the PRO
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Stuyvesant

Other judges on panel: Saif Zihiri. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I vote Regis off the 2 teams in PF.
 Natural Disasters Aid team was well explained
 and also the turn on deterrence about Guam
 was similarly well-explained.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

- Speaker 1 (Team 1) 4
- Speaker 2 (Team 2) 4
- Cross-Ex 3
- Speaker 3 (Team 1) 4
- Speaker 4 (Team 2) 4
- Cross-ex 3
- Speaker 1 Summary 2
- Speaker 2 Summary 2
- Grand Cross-ex (all 4) 3
- Speaker 3 Final Focus 2
- Speaker 4 Final Focus 2
- Prep Time (each team) 2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Stuyvesant GJ	POINTS (0-30)
3	Zachary Ginsberg	29.5
1	Daniel Ju	29.5

CON

Spkr	Regis BC	POINTS (0-30)
4	Andrew Bigelow	27.5
2	Jordan Campbell	27.5

Winner: Stuyvesant GJ debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con)
 School/Team

Signature: [Signature] School: Byram Hills

Other judges on panel: Jackson Blossom. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~Pro~~
Location: Pro very clearly wins this point. Pro makes numerous args about ↓ vulnerability, ↑ aid response, and ↑ deterrence from spreading around. Con pretty much repeats treatments that were very well rebutted, gaining absolutely no ground. Pro wins the location and "spreading around" point.

Chinese Acquisition: Con does not adequately respond to arg about OK being perceived as a threat. Only response is "its old" which pro very clearly shows how OK is the cause of aggression. ~~Pro~~

Japan militarizing: Con's point about the constitution makes no sense. With a Japanese military, con's arguments stated that Japan is able to respond in self defense. Pro made it clear that the Senkaku Islands are Japanese territory, and that Japan will be able to respond to threats - decisively. They're not talking about offensive ops, they're talking to defend retaliation. Pro makes it EXTREMELY CLEAR that withdrawing from OK will cause Japan to build up which will act as a significant deterrent against China and will solve for arms ag. Con does not address this and merely states that Chinese leadership is the problem. Pro's arg makes much more sense and is more fleshed out. This pro wins this point.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

Resolved: The United States should withdraw its military presence from Okinawa.
 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 a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
 Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
 Neither the pro nor con should 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 should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced.
 No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.
 Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO

Spkr	Stuyvesant GJ	POINTS (0 - 30)
3	Zachary Ginsberg	
1	Daniel Ju	

CON

Spkr	Regis BC	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Andrew Bigelow	
2	Jordan Campbell	

Winner: Regis BC debating on the CON
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: J. Blossom School: Hackley

*Please chair this round. Other judges on panel: Zach Frieden. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Very close Round, Excellent, both.
 Stuy: would China really attack or demer US base at Okinawa?
 Dispersal argument deflated by this logic, and Regis contests w/ China's modern weaponry. CON posits a scary China, with expansionist desires, and provides evidence. "Middle kingdom" civilization clash / Chinese largess defended by CON as a serious problem.
 Clash on constitutional crisis w/ R J- militarize & leans CON as waslog.
 Indeed, Japan can't help defend South Korea, or wouldn't. Yes, China's calculus would change, Stuy, but could be for the worse; I accept that O base is an old construct in China's eyes - they still seek openings to apply leverage - which Regis repeats. FF/Stuy point that Peace (stability) must be created is compelling, but Regis overviews recent accords by Japan in SQ.
 Humanitarian prioritizing is good/efficient, but is this carried the summary/FF? in

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 2 (Team 2)	4
Cross-Ex	3
Speaker 3 (Team 1)	4
Speaker 4 (Team 2)	4
Cross-ex	3
Speaker 1 Summary	2
Speaker 2 Summary	2
Grand Cross-ex (all 4)	3
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2
Prep Time (each team)	2

This implies Round is more about Security/Protection of base - which CON frames/Defends more