

YALE INVITATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DIVISION

Yale University  
September 19-21, 2014

PROPOSITION

POS	School: Amity	POINTS:	RANKS:
2	Speaker: Frank Karkhan	25.5	
3	Speaker: Matthew Sacco	25	

OPPOSITION

POS	School: St. Luke's	POINTS:	RANKS:
1	Speaker: Elita Rosner	25.5	
4	Speaker: Chloe Keresegjan	25	

The better debating was done by the OPP from St. Luke's  
Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This debate was very difficult to analyze due to the arguments remaining on a rather basic level, ~~and~~ they were not analyzed as much as they could have (e.g. the fact that the Baltics are not a part of Rumia could be because of NATO).  
 Thus, I found myself asking whether the government's plan would really change the world for the better. Although the opp spent a lot of time on irrelevant points (NATO in the news etc.), they convinced me that the prop's plan would not change the world in a significant way and it would mostly still be either countries working together ~~under the banner of NATO~~ or separately (much as with the case of ISIS) just the way they do this under the banner of NATO.

# YALE INVITATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DIVISION

Yale University  
September 19-21, 2014

Fight A: Start ASAP  
Yale Invitational Parliamentary Division

Semis 8 12m 3

POS	SCHOOL	POINTS	RANKS
1	School: St Lukes	27	
2	Speaker: Eliza Rosner	27	
3	Speaker: Unioe kedjan	26.5	

OPPOSITION

POS	SCHOOL	POINTS	RANKS
1	School: Amity	27	
2	Speaker: Frank	27	
3	Speaker: Matthew	25.5	

PROPOSITION

The better debating was done by the Prop from Amity

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: *[Signature]*

*[Signature]* Xinyu Guo

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Four extremely passionate and talented speakers.

The Opposition did a great job ~~showing~~ <sup>self</sup> that the interests of NATO and the <sup>self</sup> interest of a country are not always aligned and that "not acting" is sometimes the result of a better decision making process. The Proposition however presented a solid case of how US seems to dominate the NATO and the efficiency and effectiveness of the latter ~~are~~ <sup>are</sup> compromised. It was a close call.

# YALE INVITATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DIVISION

Yale University  
September 19-21, 2014

Fight A: Start ASAP  
Yale Invitational Parliamentary Division

Semis 8 12m 3

**OPPOSITION**

Pos	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	St Luke		
	Speaker: P	1	
	Speaker: K	20.5	3

**PROPOSITION**

Pos	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Amity		
	Speaker: K	20	4
	Speaker: S	20	2

The better debating was done by the Prop from Amity  Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: Gunter

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

# YALE INVITATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DIVISION

Yale University  
September 19-21, 2014

Semis 8 Rm 2

Yale Invitational Parliamentary Division

Fight A: Start ASAP

## PROPOSITION

Pos	School:	Points:	Ranks
PM	Speaker: Veronica Ma	25.5	4
MP	Speaker: Erik Eason	26	2

## OPPOSITION

Pos	School:	Points:	Ranks
MO	Speaker: Aradia Beck	26	3
LO	Speaker: Spencer Pollock	27	1

The better debating was done by the Opp from West - PP  
PROP or OPP TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION

### Framework Debate

"Complex problems" is used by you to define role of U.N. but they define complex essentially as unsolved issues, which is a self-serving question. ie; if it is complex under this definition it is inherently unresolved for also redefined the frame work in every speech from "problems" to "complex problems" to "problems on independent nation etc solve" which opp's examples all fell under.

Overall good debate & excellent speaking in the end opp won.

Opp had weak examples, but better explained why severity doesn't necessarily equal weight of ops, and why for each framework change by the gov their examples were upheld.

# YALE INVITATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DIVISION

Yale University  
September 19-21, 2014

Yale Invitational Parliamentary Division

Figure A: Start ASAP

Semis 8 Rm 2

## PROPOSITION

Pos	School:	Points:	Ranks
	New Canaan		
PM	Speaker: Veronica Mo	25.5	4
MC	Speaker: Eric Eason	26	2

## OPPOSITION

Pos	School:	Points:	Ranks
	Vestfald		
LD	Speaker: Spencer Pdkon	26.5	1
NO	Speaker: Amelia Rice	26	3

The better debating was done by the Coe from Vestfald  
PRIOR CLIP  
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: 

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- | PM   | MC   |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- confident style</li> <li>- nice case work</li> <li>- structure your rebuttal</li> <li>- Do not be a moving target</li> <li>+ Analytic presentation and great use of analogies</li> <li>+ good organization and range</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Do not be a moving target</li> <li>- The last few minutes felt less prepared and more sporadic</li> </ul>   |
| LD   | NO   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ nice &amp; notion of moving target</li> <li>+ rebuttal was the best speech</li> <li>- modulate your inflection</li> <li>- use less trivial examples (i.e. smulpas but-)</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ good range and variation of drops</li> <li>+ nice questioning of moving target</li> <li>- some of the case felt a bit mixed</li> <li>- some of the rhetoric was studdy</li> </ul> |

RFD: Gov continually tried to change the parameters for an Opp victory; for this judge, at least, it did not work.

# YALE INVITATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DIVISION

Yale University  
September 19-21, 2014

Flight A: Start ASAP  
Yale Invitational Parliamentary Division  
Trevor Semis 8 PM 2

PROPOSITION

Pos	School: New Canaan	POINTS:	RANKS
PM	Speaker: Veronica Ma	26	
MG	Speaker: Erik Esos	<del>26</del> 26	

OPPOSITION

Pos	School: Westfield	POINTS:	RANKS
LO	Speaker: Spencer Kinam	26.5	
MO	Speaker: Amelia Peck	26	

The better debating was done by the opp from Westfield  
Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

opp did not present ~~any~~ <sup>substantial</sup> evidence ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~debate~~; examples like smallpox, Montreal Convention would have been instrumentally helpful. Permit and female genital mutilation are trivial compared to war, climate change. Gov, however, constantly referred their framework, which made it hard to credit them with a win. Besides awards, you did not have a credible rebuttal