

Room: Sprague 101

2012 Sprague Invitational Debate

Round Start:

Ballot Due

Affirmative: Corvallis High School EA

Negative: Tigard High School MB

Name	Points (30-20)	Name	Points (30-20)
Eli Allen	2 25	Margaret Butler	1 28

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ☐

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Eli, I'm sure using your computer is efficient for you, but power is always unreliable at tournaments - you need to have paper copies as a back up for judges who may not allow computers in the round. By not having your cases, you admitted you wouldn't have all your citations on hand, which isn't good!

This was a very good round, thank you both. The central debate came down to the idea of how do you improve the government and allow it to help its citizens to the best of its ability, since a highly effective and compassionate government would support both your cases. The Aff argued that by taking on Universal Health care the government to improve, and the neg argued that the government must improve independently of universal health care before it can tackle it. The neg's many examples of how the federal government is not a healthy, reliable "self" capable of helping others was a very strong argument, one I never felt the Aff rebutted adequately. If we are letting a proven racist "self" be the sole administrator of health care, how will that force the government to change - no mention was ever made of a separate body who would/could force improvement other than the apparent government/self desire to do so. Because I agree with the Neg that forcing a corrupt system to take on additional burdens will only lead to more corruption, I vote for the negation.

Affirmative: Century High School EV

Negative: Tigard High School PA

Name	Points (30-20)	Name	Points (30-20)
Emily Van Vleet	28	Paul Altotsky	27

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

For the Aff
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Thurston
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

US ought to guarantee universal healthcare for its citizens

Neg: You have a really good way of trying to steer the topic with the dichotomy of the past body vs. the people however, I don't think you use it in a way that wins you the round. The first problem is that if I look to pragmatism the evidence in this round does seem to suggest to me that a universal healthcare system would be effective at saving lives. If I look to liberty I agree with the aff that healthcare for everyone (there is one is forcing them to buy) is probably good for liberty. You did a good job focusing on my paradigm of Value/Criterion clash, but you didn't do enough work to prove why the neg met those values and criterion. Even though you may be right about some of the flawed logic of the aff in using the social contract to affirm you, legitimately, it doesn't matter if you don't win your own case.

Aff: Good job. I would focus more after the first speech about ~~why~~ a universal healthcare system reduces costs and up coverage. This would help you more easily answer the pragmatism argument from the neg.

Room: Sprague 103

2012 Sprague Invitational Debate

Round Start:

Ballot Due

Affirmative: Silverton High School MT

Negative: Sprague High School TA

NamePoints
(30-20)NamePoints
(30-20)Michael
Timmons29

Treyvor Austin

25

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ____



JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

N/A

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Michael

- consider paraphrasing rather than quoting for fluidity
- your presentation could be polished
- very good organization

Treyvor

- be confident, some thoughts do not need to be verbalized as they weaken your credibility
- avoid talking about time
- practice using time wisely

The stronger case and refutations were in affirmation of this case.

Room: Sprague 107

2012 Sprague Invitational Debate

Round Start:

Ballot Due

Affirmative: Crescent Valley High School JL

Negative: South Eugene High School MC

NamePoints
(30-20)NamePoints
(30-20)

Jessica Liu

26

Michelle Chan

28

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ☒

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Aff - Your value of social welfare and util. are basically the same. Is per capita spending due to universal health care or due to cost of our system. Your contention 1 to one cont 2 to are basically the same. - Case is 1:15 short - please expand and diversify.

Neg - During ask pointed questions - Never land up would you elaborate on... How is mandatory health coverage to Insurance Companies w/ no internal/individual coercion? How would having access to health care make people sadder? If the people and not government have to get Quality of life, would people be better without government?

Aff - Try to diversify your arguments you give the same over and over again.

Neg - You need to expand on helping one person gives a better result than filling the needs of an entire group of people, and how being a group hurts the individual. - wouldn't by your logic of universal health care mean that things like mandatory voting age 18 and drinking age 21 be immoral and unethical because they are federal legislation for everyone, and not per individual? - How can anytime you help a group be unethical? It just can't be.

RFD This debate is a strange one - Aff says universal health care is X, Neg says it is Y, and then both sides try to prove the other is wrong with giving no evidence, nor any proof which side is better. I have to look at the larger implications of the argument and I feel Neg is basically saying all federal action is immoral, which she even says is false. I have to vote Aff on this internal contradiction.

Room: Sprague 114

2012 Sprague Invitational Deba

Round Start:

Ballot Due

Affirmative: Lake Oswego DT

Negative: Westview High School RS

Name	Points (30-20)
_____ Dan Tudorica _____	<u>24</u>

Name	Points (30-20)
_____ Rama Somayajula _____	<u>25</u>

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

AFF

- 3 contentions were clearly stated.
- You missed some opportunities to challenge him on some obvious weaknesses in his case. For example, universal health care does not only benefit the poor or that people who don't have health care now don't want it.

NEG

- Valid points about cost of h. care and government intrusiveness
- Avoid such blanket generalities as mentioned above. He could have attacked you on those

Comments for both -

① Neither of you seem to understand "Obama Care" well. It has only partially been implemented, so we don't currently have universal health care.

② You both made bold claims w/ no evidence to support examples:

- "Obama care" only benefits poor
- most middle class people can afford health care
- Rich people should pay more taxes just because they're rich
- Universal hicare is working in other countries

Both arguments relied too heavily on generalizations.

Room: Sprague 115

June Crest - Century

2012 Sprague Invitational Deba

Round Start:

Ballot Due

Affirmative: Westview High School AA

Negative: South Eugene High School SJ

Name

Points
(30-20)

Name

Points
(30-20)

Ananth Agarwal

28

Syrus Jin

27

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Aff Great Case - organized & well supported!
You handled questions very well during CX! "

Neg Practice your Neg case a little more - a lot of stumbling during the first few minutes. Your case is well supported. Work on having more eye contact - This will come w/ practice "

RFD: Thanks for the wonderful debate! " I vote Aff because he proves that: (1) Univ. Health Care improves overall health which in turn helps our Society AND (2) Costs are reduced & ult. we will save Billions of dollars.
Both debaters = keep up the great work & thanks for being so polite! "

Room: Sprague 116

2012 Sprague Invitational Debate

Round Start:

Ballot Due

Affirmative: Wilson High School AO

Negative: Sprague High School GA

Name	Points (30-20)	Name	Points (30-20)
<u>2</u> Ashlynn Olsen <u>2</u> <u>28</u>		<u>1</u> Georgia Armitage <u>1</u> <u>29</u>	

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win?

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Aff - Why should I value deontology? you need analysis and philosophy justifying this. Why does social contract guarantee universal health care? It seems like you're just giving impromptu analysis from case. You need pre-written cases that you memorize at least until you're more comfortable w/ debate. Connect the case to your value more - why do we need UHC to fulfill deontology?

Neg - Put some philosophy or at least analysis on your value and criterion. Good use of evidence in case - I like that you use some empirical and some anecdotal evidence as well. Be sure you connect UHC to deontology - specify we must reject UHC under a deontological perspective - this will turn the value to your side. Good refutation of value and criterion but give me specific voters!

PLEASE LOOK AT THE JUDGE DURING CX.

RFD Neg proves that UHC decreases patient's ability to access health care and that the free-market works better. Aff claims that's not relevant but it proves that the gov't has an obligation to solve. Also, Aff relies on social contract to achieve value - Neg proves that the Supreme Court has never recognized a citizen's right for health care. Thus, Aff is out of value. Wonderful debate. BOTH OF YOU ARE BORN TO BE L.D. DEBATERS! STICK WITH IT!

X X X 3

Prep - Neg: 2:00 Rem.

Aff

Room: Sprague 117

2012 Sprague Invitational Debate

Round Start:

Ballot Due

Affirmative: Lake Oswego MP

Negative: Westview High School CC

Name

Points
(30-20)

Name

Points
(30-20)

1001 Min Park

1282

Cindy Chou

227.5

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win?

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

AFF - Good use of quotes to substantiate arguments, but be cautious of overuse of quotes and source material. It's a balance. In Opening Statement - definitions were offered but were not clearly identified as being the "Definitions." Also in Opening Statement, Contention #1 clearly identified but #2 and #3 were not; it was only under Cross Exam that Contentions #2 and #3 were specifically labeled. Repeated return to Contention #1 was good (45 million people) but #2 and #3 should have been equally enlisted to develop argument. Excellent support of moral imperative by referencing back to 45-million people (Contention #1). Always - call for the judges vote in your favor.

NEG - Under Cross Exam you seemed unsure - voice was soft, posture down - but in your Constructive Speech you were strong with a clear voice. Clearly stated contentions and reference back to them in Rebuttal. In Rebuttal, ~~some~~ of the arguments were undeveloped; evidence to support was not cited (even your voice became weak which expressed a ~~low~~ level of ~~de~~ awareness in what you were trying to argue).

Don't worry (or say) what your opponent can/can't do in her closing as that's the job of the judge in making a decision. Always - every time - call for the vote in your favor.

L.P.S. much stronger ability than at Barlow - Good Job! Keep going!

Affirmative: Silverton High School JS

Negative: Clackamas High School KC

NamePoints
(30-20)NamePoints
(30-20)

Jonathan Sisley

28

Kevin Chu

26

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win?

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Aff had very strong opening constructive speech backed by plenty of 3rd party sources and also nice touch by adding in the 8th Amendment of basic human rights also excellent comparison that health care was just as important as education. Poor health linked to lower income (children poor health = poor attendance in school lower performance)

Negative argued that increased taxes would be economic burden on most families and would have to choose between taxes (paying more) or food. Some 3rd party sources in the negs negative constructive speech backing up how much taxes would go up, or why taxes would go up would have made the case stronger

Jonathan spoke clearly and was well organized in making the aff's points

Kevin made good points but much of the 3rd party sources I felt would have been better provided earlier in the debate

Kevin could benefit by speaking a little louder which would give more confidence

I give the win to the Aff based on strong opening as mentioned in my opening paragraph

Room: Sprague 119

2012 Sprague Invitational Deba

Round Start:

Ballot Due

Affirmative: Lincoln HS NH

Negative: Silverton High School LM

Name

Points
(30-20)

Name

Points
(30-20)

____ Noah Hoffman ____

24

____ Luis Morales ____

25

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Aff. should be tightened up - some passages redundant
 Aff. admits UHc plan and evidence will close racial gap
 in own 2AC?

Aff. I is a push

Aff II - Neg's II does close

} Sorry Aff. Neg did
 address your contentions

Really the whole debate is a push but Aff.
 fails to adequately address Cont II regarding
 racial gap

Affirmative: Silverton High School HW

Negative: Century High School CO

Name	Points (30-20)
Houston Winslow	25

Name	Points (30-20)
Christopher O'Brien	26

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ☐

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Houston — Good job of projecting confidence & poise. I would encourage you to look up from your notes during the 1st speech, and modulate your volume to the circumstances. (Your volume would have been perfect, from a podium, but here you were only 4 feet from the judge). You stuck to your criterion and argued them well. Mistakes: You quoted an article without giving credit (by noting that it was a quotation & identifying the author/source), you appeared not to acknowledge that universal health care would have to be paid for by taxpayers (when you said, in response to cross-X: "No, everyone gets it all for free") and you confusingly stated that even "cosmetics" would be free. In the future, try to use up more of your time by having more arguments. You used up less than 1/2 of the time allotted to you.

Christopher — You have a natural calm appearance when you speak, and a relaxed manner even when questioning & being questioned. You did a good job of clarifying a point of confusion (re: the needs of the many outweighing the needs of the few, to which you said yes, you believed in that) but not before specific individuals.

Room: Sprague 001

2012 Sprague Invitational Deba

Round Start:

Ballot Due

Affirmative: Silverton High School AWMM

Negative: Westview High School NKSB

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
1	Aidan Wall	3	27
3	Mark Mulder	4	27

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
2	Nimisha Kapur	2	30
4	Sai Bandi	1	30

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate

Low Point Win? __

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

I personally believe that the Neg is a tough side to win, but the Neg really pulled through with great points, sound evidence, and excellent confidence. It is probably time to stop debating in the novice division. Both teams did fantastic. Sanctions, schools, and econ development outweigh potential harms from US PP in ME.

Aidan: Starting a speech w/ a definition is probably the weakest intro. Good speech though. Nice points. Good evidence. An econ. point might make your case stronger. Don't use preptime for CX - that's silly. Have more confidence in CX.

You have to answer the attacks made on your case and repair your case - all you did was repeat your points while ignoring theirs... That doesn't contribute much to the round.

Nimisha: Great speech. I like the econ and edu points. Great speech structure. Don't ask if you can ask a question during CX. Of course you can. Just ask it. Have more confidence in CX. Great rebuttle speech.

Mark: Have more confidence while you speak. You are making good points - just believe what you are saying. Make sure you answer every one of your opponents points. You made some great points during CX, don't be intimidated into pulling back the punches.

Sai: I love the argument about sanctions on Iran are good for US security. Great job covering the flow. Excellent speech! good cross. Be careful about trivializing the deaths of Pakistani civilians.

*I need to see a lot more evidence used in this round from both teams.

Affirmative: Tigard High School EAKY

Negative: Lincoln HS MOSW

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
-----	------	----------	----------------

1	Ervanny Astari	3	26
---	----------------	---	----

2	Kasey Yoke	4	25
---	------------	---	----

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
-----	------	----------	----------------

1	Mai O'Neill	2	27
---	-------------	---	----

2	Sophie Wolfe	1	28
---	--------------	---	----

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ☒

Debbie Wilbanks

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Sprague

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

The strongest contentions on both sides were the ones that were most poorly refuted. And I felt of the two, Aff's contention that military presence in the mid-east gives rise to terrorism was stronger than Neg's contention that Obama's hands-off policy in Libya was the correct one.

I felt that both Aff's contention that the U.S.'s alliance with Israel prevents normal U.S.-mid-east relations and Neg's contention that the U.S. being the only super-power to "invest" in the mid-east were very weak.

Ervanny: Don't read so much straight from paper - eye contact.

Mai: Good eye contact, nice poise

Kasey: Try to use more tonality; you can speak louder (I heard it in cross-fire!)

Sophie: well done; good eye contact; nice modulated voice

Affirmative: Tigard High School MPMP

Negative: Westview High School HGAC

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
1	Mihir Paralkar	3	27	1	Hersh Godse	1	29
2	Mayur Paralkar	4	27	2	Alex Chang	2	28

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? __

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Sprague
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

I find for the negative for the following reasons:

- Their contentions mostly remained unrefuted through the course of the debate.- esp. the safety of drone strikes and the humanitarian aspects of our policies.
- They used the crossfire rounds to effectively assert the way their contentions relate to and refute the affirmative contentions.
- While the affirmative had solid points, they allowed negative to steal the frame of the argument and drive the direction of the debate.

Mihir ⊕ Strong points in the initial contentions and great source citations
 ⊖ Clarify crossfire questions more to convey the point you want to make.

Mayur ⊕ Solid recap of their contentions with refutes and building on the points made by your teammate.
 ⊖ Resorted to hyperbole in your closing remark instead of driving your points home.

Hersh ⊕ Excellent inclusion of a graph for effect. Really nice crossfire questioning, especially pushing the other team's assertions by using new drone data.
 ⊖ Spell out acronyms next time (IRC/CSRS). I had to figure out what those organizations were and it drew focus away from your next point.

Alex ⊕ Nice refute of the soldier death points and the economic points.
 Very articulate in your points and organization.
 ⊖ Final focus was a little off. While you restated some points, it did not wrap up the debate as well as it could have.

Affirmative: Sprague High School CWCG

Negative: Silverton High School NKMK

Pos Name RK (1-4) Points (30-20)

I Chris West 26 I

II Colin Gesik 27 III

Pos Name RK (1-4) Points (30-20)

II Nathan Kawaguchi IV 26

I Mariah Kimlinger II 26

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _

Danish Kumar
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Westview High School
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Chris West

Mariah

Colin Gesik

Nathan

make more eye
Contacts. good Content
and overall good
flow. layed down
basic foundation and
clerly stated the
scope and impact.
speech was organized
Providing facts and
Sources will be
needed.

CFI didn't remember
opponent Contentions?
shoud follow and
understand opponents
Points and.
be ready to negate.
Build more eye
Contacts and flow
for speech.

good Flow and
Confidence.
too short. 1/2 time,
shoud have included
more contents to
Provide fact such as
How much US has
spend whenciting
budget deficiency.
seems low on
Contents and
Preparations.
Not shown Impact
of Current Policies
on Middle east or
other countries

Good eye
Contact and.
Contents. don't
repeat and focus
on quality. Needs
proof for No
major Attacks
after 9/11?
Stated Impacts
from opponents
are vague.
but did not
specify why
or which
Contention
Impacts are
vague.
Don't Ask for Sources
or think data
Provided does not
seem right.

good Affirmation
of team's Contentions
add Illustrations of
the Impacts.
Try asking for sources
only when you don't
think the data is
right. Also focused
more on having less
Number of Contentions
Instead of Extending
and their team's
Points. overall.
had good vocab.
Vocabulary and
eye Contacts but seem
low on contents.

Room: Sprague 008

2012 Sprague Invitational Deba

Round Start: 4.4.3.4.3.2.2.3.2.2

Ballot Due

Affirmative: Century High School FKMD

Negative: Silverton High School APTG

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
2	Faith Knell	2	27
1	Mark Duenas	4	26

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
1	Andrea Ponce-Velez	1	28
2	Tania Gaspar	3	27

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _

Jennifer Gvuter

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Clackamas H.S.

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Mark - Nice Scarf! Clear case and easy to follow ideas. Practice saying tough words it will help your credibility. Take more prep time next time to make sure you are ready for your speech. Good job once you got started. Work on being more organized.

Faith Good job staying organized and doing some critical thinking to refute the neg case. Try to be more confident - you were doing great. Good job having voters ready for your last speech.

RFD The neg team seemed better prepared and had better clash. Good job both teams.

Andrea - well written ideas. Look at your audience more to convince us you believe what you are saying. Good clash with your rebuttal, good analysis and confidence. Sign-post more, but generally your speeches were organized.

Tania Reading your prewritten rebuttal does not help you show what you know. Clash and analyze in your own words. Don't pickpicks during your voters.

Affirmative: Sprague High School CABR

Negative: Century High School MENC

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
1	Chris Arreola	4	27.5
2	Brandon Roth	3	28

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
1	Micah Eulberg	2	28.5
2	Nick Carleson	1	29

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? N

[Signature]
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Lakeridge HS
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Neg: you read Kagan as an impact card, but you should have a better link to it; (i.e, current policy key to hege). Also with the Kohnke evidence - it says u.s. exercising leadership is good, but not that we are doing that in the Middle East / doesn't say why ME policy changing would trigger the impacts. you also need arguments about how installing democracy is feasible in the ME.

Aff: Be careful with time allocation. You're making good arguments, but are being spread a bit thin.

Chris - you seemed disengaged from the round after your 2nd speech.

Short term costs (loss of lives, threat of Pakistan) are outweighed by the production of long term security w/ current policies.

~~Negative: Century High School CGCG~~

<u>Pos</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>RK (1-4)</u>	<u>Points</u> <u>(30-20)</u>
<u>1</u>	Christian Geddes	<u>2</u>	<u>27</u>

3 Chase Geddes 1 28

Low Point Win?

Sprague
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

- 2 - Great addition of professionals' quotes; this adds to your case in comparison
- You stumbled a tiny bit at one point, which indicates you may need to go over your case more
- Unfortunately, you didn't really give a concrete Middle Eastern example to your CX answer: (non-Cuban)
- Great reflection of point of this particular debate (hegemony)
- Great computer virus rebuttal! Brilliant!!!
- Please watch your ^{glaring} negative facial expressions and hand gestures during opponents' speeches

- [4] - great eye contact! You try not to rely on your notes which is great.
- wonderful point about how many turn to terrorism for economic stability. This is sad, but true.
- You guys should have rebutted to this rebuttal!
- Iran bombing Israel = bad but not a threat to U.S. hegemony, just a threat to an ally and thus our interests
- Your sarcasm is great b/c it isn't mean!
- nice smile!

too. There's literally nothing to discuss at that point.

Round Start:

Ballot Due

~~Neg~~

Affirmative: Century High School HMLH

~~ACK~~

Negative: Sprague High School ASKG

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
1	Holden Mercurio	3	26
2	Laura Huskey	1	26

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
2	Anna Silberman	4	26
1	Kate Goldsworthy	2	26

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? __

Clark Yeakle
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Clackamas
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Neg 1 Good speaker but you interrupted during ex several times. I specifically asked you to be polite.

I specifically asked for politeness. You were all rude in ex. If you ask for a judge's paradigms, don't ignore them.

ACK 1 & 2 Your speeches were both very good, but your definitions were abusive. Of course U.S. policy is undermining Middle Eastern National Security. The real debate was around the U.S. Your best topical argument was that the U.S. is losing Allies, but this was not strong enough to stand on it's own. Try to not interrupt in ex. It looks bad.

Neg 2 You held up the topicality which was very important. You are a good speaker. Try to be careful claiming the first question. It is more polite and professional to offer the first question.

Decision: First, Neg won both topicality arguments. The way the resolution was worded, it is directed at U.S. National security. Thus, Middle Eastern deaths do not affect U.S. National security directly. I was disappointed, because both sides barely focused on the Middle East. Ultimately, Neg showed U.S. was not in danger.

Affirmative: Westview High School SPKC

Negative: Sprague High School DOJM

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
2nd	Saachi Patel	4	24
1st	Kathryn Chen	3	25

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
2nd	Devon O'Donnell	1	29
1st	Jeff Metzger	2	28

Current US foreign policy in Mid East undermines our national security
 Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? __

Lincoln

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Kathryn * Just reading case without eye contact was uninteresting - to follow
 * Case offered present examples that were spread across SW Asia, N. Africa
 as promised in defn - Nice! Summary → Didn't offer sufficient contrasting analysis.

JEFF * Nice volume & enthusiasm in speaking style.
 - Speaking when leaning down on desk top isn't a power position.
 - Hm: "The onion" → Really?

Saachi - Merely re-stating the Aff case isn't good use of
 one minute & 30 seconds when you don't offer anything new. ^{evidor} ^{argumen}
 Although this speaker projects a confident speaking style, she
 failed to respond in a meaningful way to neg's case &/or
 add new evidence to aff case. Speaker has a lovely voice which could be very successful
 in radio. To be a better debater, she'll need more content and analysis. ^{More} ^{Resistant} ^{to} ^{off} ^{action}

Jeff - Excellent pace of delivery, strong eye contact & solid analysis.
 You did, in fact, "dismantle" the Aff case, as promised.
 Digging in plastic bag for evidence was a bit noisy and slightly un-
 professional.

RFD - "WHAT WE DO TODAY AFFECTS TOMORROW" Negs were
 able to define terms well, set a burden (which they met), provide contentions with
 warrants that were worthwhile and accurate, dismantle Aff case & extend convincing
 arguments in favor of resolution. Whereas, Aff's failed after IAC to carry their
 burdens by failing to attack the neg case &/or defend aff case. I felt little to no
 clash was provided by Aff and way too much repetition of the case. To win, Aff
 needs to argue against neg and strengthen its own case that was undone by Negs

Room: Sprague 133

2012 Sprague Invitational Deba

Round Start:

Ballot Due

Affirmative: Sprague High School DWRH

Negative: Century High School CDCF

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
3	Danica Wilbanks	3	27
1	Riley Hoyt	2	27

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
4	Connor Dalipson	4	26
2	Chris Finley	1	28

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? Tie

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Hoyt - Excessive reading -
 good hand movement -
 good analysis relying
 facts to support the
 affirmation - drone attack
 the Patriot act -
 on cross fire - gave an excellent
 definition of jigsaw (sp??)

Finley - good speech speed
 after very fast opening speech
 good argument - convincing
 lack of democracy breeds
 extremism. Good argument about
 good argument about
 can't we allow extremism
 70% of terrorism in non-democratic
 societies is a persuasive argument!

Wilbanks
 Slow Down!! Speak slower
 good crossfire - slowed speech
 but not slow enough
 gave good examples support
 your position like Bahrain
 Democracy does not mean they
 get rid of extremists
 uses Egypt as an example.

Dalipson - Speak slower!
~~avoid side arguments like~~
 very interesting argument w/
 factual examples of how US
 policy currently prevents
 war in democracies
 Not as convincing as he needs to
 slow down & project his voice.

Affirmative: Sprague High School TFCS

Negative: Tigard High School CCKA

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
1	Trevor Ferris	3	28
2	Chris Silver	4	28

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
2	Cassidy Cole	2	28
1	Kristian Allen	1	29

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

AFF1: Good organization, shouting Hitler isn't a point.

AFF2: Nice work addressing every point clearly.

Neg1: Very good speaking.

Neg2: Good job speaking clearly.

AFF: I accepted your definition, but that could have been a much stronger point. Impact your points. They are meaningless without impact.

Neg: Israel and Palestine is a huge issue that you should not just wave away. You certainly should have addressed that and refuted it in a way more substantial than saying it doesn't matter. Also, your source strike information was not true and the AFF printed that out.

Decision: AFF won because neg failed to address key points in a satisfactory way, and their only offensive voter was disproven.

Overall, it was close.

Affirmative: Sprague High School AFBG

Negative: Tigard High School DSJG

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
1	Aujalee Fisher	3	26

2	Blake Gesik	4	26
---	-------------	---	----

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
1	Daniel Sacks	2	29

2	Jake Garcia	1	29
---	-------------	---	----

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win?

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

ASK FOR PARADIGMS.

AUJALEE → WAIT YOUR ATTITUDE. → GOOD ATTEMPT AT A BROAD VOCABULARY.

BLAKE → I AM SO CONFUSED ALL OF YOUR SPEECH, YOU DON'T TELL ME ANYWHERE TO GO ON MY FLOW. YOUR ARGUMENTS ARE CONFUSING. SLOW DOWN. YOU SAID IN YOUR CASE THAT IT WAS SINCE THE WAR STARTED. NOT CURRENT

ALL → HERE IS THE DEAL, WOULD YOU STILL HAVE THE SAME ATTITUDES IF YOUR GRAND MOTHER WAS YOUR JUDGE? THIS IS PUBLIC DEBATE, IF YOU WANT TO ACT LIKE THAT, PUT IN THE EXTRA EFFORT AND DO POLICY.

RFD → NEG WINS BECAUSE OF AFFS DEFINITION OF NATION.

Affirmative: Clackamas High School AMMC

Negative: Westview High School CLJL

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
<u>2</u>	Akshay Moorthy	<u>2</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>1</u>	Candace La	<u>4</u>	<u>26</u>
<u>1</u>	Morgan Custer	<u>1</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>2</u>	Janet Lee	<u>3</u>	<u>27</u>

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? __

Lori Schmidt
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Unaff.
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

The affirmative side presented their arguments w/ evidence & citations. The arguments were laid out well by first speaker, defined w/ examples by both speakers and they addressed the cons arguments against their plan well and were able to give specific numbers and ^{specific} information in crossfire w/ evidence cited in articles etc.

Akshay: very witty and quick in responding to questions & asked good relevant ^{thought provoking} questions in crossfire.

Morgan: He knows his information, statistics, and arguments well. gave very impressive responsive responses in crossfire.

Janet: Speaks well & is very confident, but I thought she misstated the pros arguments & statements several times, although she did present well.

↓ over

Room: Sprague 010

2012 Sprague Invitational Debate

Round Start:

Ballot Due

Affirmative: Lincoln HS JMWL

Negative: Sprague High School QMAB

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
<u>1</u>	Jaxom Moore	<u>2</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>4</u>	Quentin Michael	<u>4</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>3</u>	Will Leo	<u>1</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>2</u>	Austin Brooks	<u>3</u>	<u>15</u>

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ☒

Katie Kantrowitz
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Silverton HS
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

nice round.

Lincoln - a difficult first foray into PF, but you did a valiant job. In the future of course you'll want to make sure you have actual sources from which to cite - you may not have known this going in. Be careful not to drop cases, too!

Will - be aware of your leg swinging - it's a little distracting. Also, generally best to not use up your time telling your judge you don't know what you're doing.

Sprague - you are obviously both talented and experienced debaters. That being said, your behavior in this round amounted to nothing short of bullying an obviously rookie team who were clearly only your opponents due to a collapsed junior-senior pattern. When a judge feels the need to urge civility in the middle of a round, you had better scale it way back.