Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tournament Date:	11/07 – 11/08	Tournament Location:		West High School	
Round/Flight: 1A	Room: 322	Division: V	Judge Name: James Judge		Affiliation/Occupation: West High School
Resolution/Topic:		Resolved: The United States should end its economic sanctions against Venezuela.			

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

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

First Team				Second Team			
Code:	Green AB	Side: ☐ Pro ☒ Con	Points	Code:	Violet CD	Side: ☒ Pro ☐ Con	Points
Speaker 1 Name:	Aiden Ayodele		28	Speaker 2 Name:	Chloe Cho		27
Speaker 3 Name:	Barack Bousaid		28	Speaker 4 Name:	Diana David		30

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

Winning Team: ☒ Pro ☐ Con	Team/Code:	Violet CD

❖ Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.

❖ Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.

❖ Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.

❖ Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.

❖ Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.

❖ **No new *arguments*** may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

- The chemistry of the team was good.
- The summary did an effective job of highlighting the key issues in the round.
- The final focus discussed a couple arguments that the summary did not focus on.
- The argument about the developmental harms was persuasive but not developed in the later parts of the round.

Comments to debaters:

- The first speaker's confidence is strong in the first speech but lacks in the summary
- The rebuttal was impressive with the turns placed on the con case.
- The summary speech dropped a couple arguments.
- The final focus did an effective job comparing arguments and crystallizing.

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

Out of neg summary on the neg case, there's a lot of uniqueness argument extensions about Maduro being bad and how he's at the core of the issues in Venezuela and not sanctions. But at no point is a solvency argument extended, meaning out of summary I don't have any link extension that tells me voting neg will actually change Maduro's status in office.

That means I'll evaluate aff off any harm I think sanctions impose. The medical supplies argument is good enough, for example. The only response read on this argument is that Maduro is the actual problem. Aff reads that, while imports were low before sanctions, they went down more, so even if removing sanctions keeps Maduro in power, it still provides a bit more medicine that saves some lives. Given that there's no argument about sanctions removing Maduro, giving a bit more medicine to save some lives is sufficient enough offense for me to affirm.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches
Speaker 1 ....4 min.
Speaker 2 ....4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)* ....3 min.
Speaker 3 ....4 min.
Speaker 4 ....4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)* ....3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary ....2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary ....2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all) ....3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus ....2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus ....2 min.
2 minutes of Prep Time per side
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.