

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Katherine Fu No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: L310

PROPOSITION

Team Name: NS DH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alyson Duff Blair MacNeil

Score
71
100

Score
70
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta SK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Andrew Kim Kat Sudhanshu

Score
88
100

Score
88
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

141
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

175
200

176

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Given Orally

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Murphy O'Connor

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: L 310

PROPOSITION

Team Name: NS DM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alyson Duff

Blair Macneil

Score
70
100

Score
68
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ALBERTA SK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Andrew Krim

Kat Siskhushin

Score
88
100

Score
88
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

138
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

178
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

The proposition did not understand the round.
The opposition not only demonstrated a better grasp of the subject matter, but also the mechanics of debate. ~~and~~ Their arguments were more robust. ~~over~~

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: RYAN ROGERS

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: L310

PROPOSITION

Team Name: NOVA SCOTIA - DM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Alyson Duff

Blair MacNeil

Score
<u>74</u>
100

Score
<u>73</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ALBERTA-SK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Andrew Kim

Kat Srikrushin

Score
<u>86</u>
100

Score
<u>87</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

<u>157</u>
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

<u>173</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- You are a very talented speaker and brought good constructive material to the round.
 - You base a lot of the improvements on the premise that Iran's nuclear development will occur with oversight, but the definition did not guarantee this - maybe define it as allowing Iran's nuclear development only if UN observers are let in
 - In your build down speech, you talked about the current strained threat posed by the status quo, yet your definition proposes to increase that threat
 - You did not convince me this bill will make Iran a more rational state
- Second Proposition

- Not sure I'm convinced by many of the links you are proposing like the link between Iran being allowed to develop weapons and Iran's relations with the international community proposing
- A lot of your rebuttal/rebuild was based on these such links which weren't really justified or explained
- Good speaking style, but I think your speech lacked substance

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- You are an extremely confident speaker and I like that you got quickly to the caseline
- Rebuttal was extremely effective, points out the lack of analysis in the prop case
- Brought excellent constructive material and analysis to the round
- Very effective build down speech, I like how you structured it in terms of how Proposition did not fulfill their burdens

Second Opposition

- Excellent reference to a policy of appeasement
- Effectively pointed out Prop's shortcomings and emphasized that reputation is based on actions
- No incentive for Iran to change social conditions of the people ✓✓
- Glad you pointed out that their model did not guarantee UN monitoring ✓✓
- Great speaking style, a little bit fast at times though

(157)

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: William Gibson

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M336

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta HL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Matthew Lee

Michael Hoskins

Score
74
100

Score
73
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba GM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ariel Melamedoff

J.J. Gerstein

Score
85
100

Score
83
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

147
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

168
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Great style, make sure you bring positive matter to the round that is it simply apologetic (eg. Iran having nukes won't be so bad)

- Second point could have been deeper (use MC's analysis of tension)

- Perhaps discuss right to self-defense

Second Proposition

- Methodical, clear style

- Make sure you engage with all points ⇒ sovereignty was left untouched.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Could have used clearer analysis of sovereignty forfeiture

- Great dynamic speech

- Be careful of unfounded hyperbole

Second Opposition

- Try to signpost even during rebuilding

- Good constructive point, make sure you tie it back to opp stance clearly

Broadly on opp. Always back up assertions of Iranian capabilities/intentions

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: JOHN VLAHOGLIANNIS

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4

Room: M336

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ~~ALBERTA~~ ALBERTA H.L.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Matthew Lee

Michael Hoskins

Score
76
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: MBGM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

ARIEL MELAMEDOFF

J.J. GERSTEIN

Score
86
100

Score
83
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

151
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

169
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

Excellent speaking skills/voice/projection
Well organized
Intellectually coherent position.
Rebuttal - could have been better

"fear mongering" attack lacked substance — need to listen to the arguments and find the weakness

Second Proposition

Good style/articulate

Didn't add anything new to the debate — did a good job of calling the opposition on the "shock value" of its arguments, but didn't follow through. Could have challenged the opposition on some of its claims.

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Self-assured, articulate speaking style
A "natural"
Intellectually coherent / well organized rebuttal
Very well done.

Second Opposition

Excellent speaking style.

Solid rebuttal.
Intellectually coherent
Good use of language
— "betting game"
— "provoked aggression"
— "accidental nuclear war"

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Julia Wagner

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M336

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta HS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Matthew Lee

Michael Hoskins

Score
77 77
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba GM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anel Melamedoff

J-J Gersten

Score
83
100

Score
81 81
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

154 154
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

164 164
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

I didn't think your PMR was very well-organized - usually, try to boil the debate down to a few salient points

Second Proposition

We didn't feel your points supported the motion enough - have to say and why it's good and not just why it's not bad

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Very well done and excellent PMR!

Second Opposition

well done, some catchy phrases as well

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: John Clarke

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3 Room:

PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC-OY

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sherwin Yousef-Zadeh Yesha Ouyang

Score
81
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC-KD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Armaan Kassar Jamal Punnar

Score
87
100

Score
82
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
159
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
169
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: BERTOLA

No. of Judges: _____

Round: 5

Room: M340

PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC OY

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

SHERVIN YOUSSEF

YESHA OUYANG

Score
80
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

BC-KD

Team Name: MEWA QR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

ARMAAN KASSAM
CHRISTOPHE PIKE

JAMAL DUMAS
LEO PLUMER

Score
87
100

Score
81
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

158
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

168
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Cam Climie (chair) No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: 340

PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC OY

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Shervin YZ

Yesha O

Score
80
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC KD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Armaan kassam

Jamal Dumas

Score
87
100

Score
82
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

157
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

169
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Focus specifically on Iran.
Model was a good attempt
but confusing.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

~~Find me~~

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: M.K. Jackson.

No. of Judges: 1 Round: 5 Room: 333

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta - ml

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Bryn Maekel Dylan Leman

Score
77 71
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: SK - HS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nitasha Salim Brittany Haughey

Score
79
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

153
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- good Pol re: knife.
- solid knowledge base.
- 4 minute speech could have been better organized for maximum impact.

} more clash.

Second Proposition

- pretty good roadmapping.
- some points were vague/abstract → focus on topic.
- could have spent more time building "reciprocity" argument.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- well-organized.
- keep pols short and to the point (one was a bit wordy)
- clear summary

Second Opposition

- good rebuttals in second half of speech.

you both need to watch verbal things ("okay", "like") so they don't distract.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Stephen McCarthy

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 5

Room: M232

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ~~MMR~~ ~~MMR~~ QC FH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zawad Hassan

Francesca Fargnoli

Score
82
100

Score
80
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ~~BC~~ ~~BC~~ BC EL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Amina Egeh

Terry Lee

Score
86
100

Score
83
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

162

200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

169

200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

~~First~~ Proposition team

- good overall!
- more analysis on sovereignty point
- go deeper into current scenario details → why will M.A.D.

~~Second Proposition~~

Judge's Comments:

~~First~~ Opposition team:

- good overall!
- perhaps better to make explicit your opposition to sovereign rights
- nice attention to the recent history of Iran.

~~Second Opposition~~

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Catherine Holloway

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M341

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Newfoundland RS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Michael Sullivan Daniel Rees

Score
79
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba SB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kirsten Solmudson Helen Beaumont

Score
76
100

Score
74
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

154
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

150
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

You had generally the best
geo-political understanding
Good POIs
Case clearly laid out

Second Proposition

Good organization
Bully argument was very vulnerable
and you were lucky not to be called
on it

Remember to give POIs

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

Good presentation style
but serious flaws in understanding
of geo-politics

Second Opposition

Some decent refutation

Didn't capitalize on a major
flaws in PROP case

Remember to use your full time

Remember to give POIs

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: SKANDER BELGIZIAD

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: W1341

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ~~MANITOBA SB~~ NEWSWINDLAND - RS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Michael Sullivan

Daniel Rees

Score
79
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ~~NEWSWINDLAND RS~~ MANITOBA - SB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kirsten Schurman

Helen Beaumont

Score
75
100

Score
77
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

156

200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

152

200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Well organized speech overall, however, facts were lacking. More Iran-centric points would have been better. Elaboration was only made (unfortunately) at the end (good whip)

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

~~Well organized speech overall, however, facts were lacking. More Iran-centric points would have been better. Elaboration was only made (unfortunately) at the end (good whip)~~
The points made were generally good (though lacking in certain facts,) and were unfortunately not very well organized in structure. Good whip speech.

Second Proposition

Good style, organization, etc...
Main criticism (goes to everyone else in the round) is the lack of facts in the debate. Many "facts" stated were not really true.
Didn't get "trust" point which isn't advisable in IR rounds as international politics has no "trust"

Second Opposition

More organized in structure in respect to LO speech. On the other hand, when reconstructing partner's points, don't only repeat what was said but also renew the elements to what was said.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Iran - nuclear weapons

Judge's Name: Tim Bonnar

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 1

Room: 341

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Newfoundland RS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Michael Sullivan

Daniel Rees

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Score
<u>70</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba SB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kirsten Solmundsen

Helen Beaumont

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

<u>155</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>153</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- good intro - I like the way the burdens were presented
- knowledge of geopolitics is reasonably strong
- talking loudly to your partners while the opponent is speaking is not polite and distracts the judges

Second Proposition

- well spoken - at times nerves are obvious - try to relax
- ask more POIs
- scholarly & fully argument with strong

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- well spoken - clear and capable
- work to make your structure clear to your audience - use signposts frequently
- some confusion over geopolitical situation
- be sure to read up frequently on the international situation

Second Opposition

- ask more POIs - or try to
- study up on geopolitics (as above)

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Celina No. of Judges: 1 Round: 4 Room: M234

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia NR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ryan Nearing Bhreagh Ross

Score
75
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec HZ

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Andrew Hamilton Victor Zhao

Score
78
100

Score
76
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

151
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

154
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- 7:48 / 5
Cyclical & repetitive arguments!
NO position? as proposition have a perspective
Canada = house? → Canada has jurisdiction for this? → remains neutral?
① Hypocrisy? → is impossible to support western policies allow?
→ IRAN poses NO THREAT.
→ do NOT dictate what another country what rule... this international community contradicts your resolution.
→ you're right, you have no right to tell another country what rule... this international community contradicts your resolution.
→ political instability
→ did not really get into the OW.
→ what about the OW?
→ Canada should not have a say in this.
→ the fairness and... touche
→ if we cannot have our policies on events in the past, really that's what we want.
→ you speak really fast.
→ confusing road mapping
→ slow saying like

Second Proposition

- 7:55
① Right to defense
→ protection of ppl...
→ making Iran a center of an international scale
→ victimizing Iran (perception of Iran)
→ election = democracy
→ is only do to...
→ doesn't mean it's a functional...
→ Canada has no right to intervene, not a pt for you though
→ political corruption → is a perception? not convinced
→ will start international conflict.
→ Refutation
→ Canada has no right to intervene, not a pt for you though
→ political corruption → is a perception? not convinced
→ will start international conflict.
→ Refutation & Reconstruction
→ violence

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- 8:07
① We do not want more nuclear weapons
→ terrible consequences.
→ no one will actually fire them... (if you are talking about Russia & US... good example with Hiroshima! however the bomb was released by the U.S...)
② Iran does not qualify as a nuclear state
→ political instability
→ rhetoric is aggressive... Gotta!
→ Nonproliferation treaty
→ peace keeping
→ consequences
→ have a right.
→ promote peaceful progress
→ slow down
→ PLEASE STOP SAYING "LIKE"

Second Opposition

- ① Not safe to have nukes
→ threat to western liberal democracies
→ opp dots
→ acts are irrational... the elaborate you have the
→ we believe Iran
→ doing they will not misuse is not a justification
→ malicious intent
→ supporting giving... not using the term giving
→ Refutation & Reconstruction
→ violence

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Brent Schmidt

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: _____

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ONTARIO SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tarang Marathe

Alistair Smith

Score
82
100

Score
85
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NOVA SCOTIA KP

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kelsey Keddy

Serie Paivig

Score
80
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

167
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Good structure and content, very well presented.

~~Very well presented~~

IMP was a bit messy

Model is weird, but fine in this round

Second Proposition

Very good speech. Thorough reputation

did an excellent job. You lied a lot, but that's okay because you sounded nice!

The argumentation was sound, though.

Good p.o.'s

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Thorough reputation, very good responses and robust analysis.

Constructive was not-as-strong. Need to ensure that your points are made well before the reply speech!

Ultimately, we didn't have a good enough stance from your side because much was asserted

Second Opposition

Great style and compelling speech. Best speaker in the round in terms of time management and effectively splitting time between con/rep/sub. You could have structured it and been more clear

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Adam Kovacs-Litman

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 2349

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Antario SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Torony Marathe

Alister Smith

Score
82
100

Score
89
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: New Scotia - KP

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Keirley Reddy

Doree Parry

Score
80
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

166
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Very well presented case, but 82 many lies!
- Your model would benefit from setting this house as the US on the West in general.
- Examples were well explained, but be careful using examples that are not technically true → India/Pakistan

Second Proposition

- Very strong analysis regarding the balance of power as a necessity for good relationships.
- Also lots of lies, but the good knows.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Your speech was good, but you made some dangerous assertions and didn't substantiate your points enough.
- You ~~did~~ told us why nukes would make people scared, but didn't tell us why this fear would necessarily lead to a hot outcome (like increased Israeli aggression).

Second Opposition

- Your speech had some excellent moments and some well-researched analysis. Your strongest points seemed weaker in the face of some of your more extreme arguments (like nuclear codes).

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: SARAH

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 343

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tarany Marathe

Alastair Smith

Score
82
100

Score
83
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia KP

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kelsey Keddy

Teric Pauig

Score
80
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

165
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Good style + definitions → might be better to define the house as the US (more meaningful in talking about the decline of American hegemony)

Organize your PMR better.

Second Proposition

Really good POs.
Good refutation.

India + Pakistan
still hate each other.
Also Kashmir.
And Cuban Missile
Crisis.

Good Round.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

You speak well, but quite quickly. You have time so slow down.

Need to explain why we can't trust Iran or why Iranian nukes make people feel more fear.

Second Opposition

Interesting argument on health of Iranian people.

Be careful with using extreme argumentation (line Iran will nuke Canada). It is less convincing.

THBT Iran has the right to dev. nuclear weapons.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jim Collins

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: M319

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ont - AW

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Connor Ahluwalia

Nate Winsor

Score
82
100

Score
79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba - ML

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nic Martin

Thomas Lamotte

Score
85
100

Score
82
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

161
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

168
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Assured, coherent reasoning & delivery.
V.G. grasp of debate case points,
issues
- You handle answers to PoI's
very well.

Second Proposition

Good debate on weakest case point!

You needed to challenge Opp. more,
though they gave you little opportunity

Both: Excellent grasp of issues overall; well constructed & argued debate.
Thank you!

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

V.G. rebuttal, grasp of case points
etc.

- You speak v. quickly but coherently -
you have much to say that is rational
& logical, but careful not to let it
run away with you!

Second Opposition

V.G.

- you ~~has~~ could have done a better
job rebutting Prop. pt. 3, which was
weakest

Both: missed a few gd. oppor. to challenge
Prop pts. to max.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: NATALYA

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M319

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ONTARIO AW

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Connor Aklunalia Nate Winsor

Score
77
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: MANITOBA ML

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nic Martin Thomas Lamothe

Score
84
100

Score
82
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score
<u>152</u>
200

152

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score
<u>166</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Proposition began with the right ideas, but needed to provide more argumentation about why we ought to care about Iran's interests (the missing link that opp rightly pointed out), as well as more on the threats faced by Iran.

Second Proposition

Opp did a good job of outlining potential harms, and in order to defeat these arguments, prop needed to do more work to prove why Iran specifically would not use nukes.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Aranschadne

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 4 Room: M319

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario AU

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

C Inna Ahluwalia Nave Wiser

Score
89
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba ML

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nic Martin

Thomas Lamothe

Score
83
100

Score
82
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

158
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

165
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Good, careful speaking style
need more details about why MAD better than alternative (e.g. What ~~can it~~ result of alternative in cold war, what could be result now)

Second Proposition

I interesting POI about how this is an internal matter need to differentiate nuclear energy / nuclear weapons

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Good points about failings of MAD needed to address why this interference in internal affairs is more justified than interference in other internal issues that have external effects

Second Opposition

Good point about nuclear energy / nuclear power, need more explanation about difference in ~~that~~ nuclear vs. other threat to world I can and US, focus on proximity of groups less convincing in situation of globalization.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Edward Lai No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: M346

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba FT

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jaclyn Flom

Ella Thomson

Score
76
100

Score
76 79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan FH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Aaron Fitzler

Arthur Hamilton

Score
83
100

Score
73
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

155
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

156
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Too much repetition
Accept more POI's!
Good rebuttal though.

Second Proposition

Too much repetition.
Accept more POI's.
Good response to opponent's
POI's.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Good, solid speech.
Excellent Rebuttal.
Very good job boiling everything
down to 3 questions.
Try not to get ~~threw~~ thrown
off by POI's too much.

Second Opposition

At times, you were supporting
the other side. This almost cost
your team the round.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Debra MIKO

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: m346

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba - FT

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jaclyn Flom

ELLE Thomson

Score
83
100

Score
84
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan FH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Aaron FRITZLER

Arthur Hamilton

Score
85
100

Score
76
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

167
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

161
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Well done Jaclyn!
Needed to really
clarify and you did

Second Proposition

Elle nice use of
strategy.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Aaron well done!
Kept the focus.

Second Opposition

Arthur good try but
muddled the points
a couple of times

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Patrick Peotto

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: M346

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba FT

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jaclyn Flom

Ella Thomson

Score
82
100

Score
82
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Saskatchewan FH

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Aaron Fritzler

Arthur Hamilton

Score
87
100

Score
84
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

164
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

171
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- > strong delivery
- > should have used hypocrisy argument

Second Proposition

- > strong delivery
- > more substantive support would have helped

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- > well organized
- > reb. was excellent
- > strong delivery

Second Opposition

- > substantive support - helped to persuade

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: A. Langlois

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M339

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba PT

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Adrienne Tessier Ryan Pistonus

Score
77
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC KT

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ben Turner Zephi Kramer

Score
82
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

142
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

162
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

good pace in your first speech
stay away from analogies like
the kindergarten one

be careful not to bring new
arguments in your 4 minutes

Second Proposition

road mapping

you need to link your arguments
back to the resolution

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

good knowledge on the topic
you need to work on your road-
mapping

Second Opposition

road mapping

glad you showed that MP's point
were not relevant to the case

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: MUHAMMAD SALIM No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: 339

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba PT

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Adrienne Tessier Ryan Pistorius

Score
79
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC KT

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ben Turner Zeph Karaman

Score
80
100

Score
79
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

157
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

159
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Style M
Judge's Comments: Def
First Proposition lay out

Judge's Comments: lay out
First Opposition

Cont
- write to defend
Hypo critical
Sovereignty

POI T

POI G

Clarify Sovereignty needs
to be earned
Democratic decision
Least Case tension

main point
Israel can do whatever
It wants because of
US is the main argument

POI T

POI G

current method
not working
S/R
Hostility & must go
Call to war

Attacks US/Israel
Mutually assured destruction
Kennedy threatened
Nuclear strikes
Shows how
Naslem
Theo crazy

Second Opposition

Second Proposition
Up Clash Very well done
Comprehensive
Rebuttal well done

POI T

POI G

Class
Splits Soviet
Rebuttal

POI G

Cont
Precedent
No common ground
They are not equal??

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Patricia Johnson-Caste No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: M39

PROPOSITION

Team Name: MB-PT

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Adrienne Tesser Ryan Pistorius

Score
78
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC KT

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Ben Turner

Zephi Kramer

Score
81
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

155
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

161
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

need better explanation
of sovereignty & justifies
nukes

ALWAYS ASK
WHY!!!

Second Proposition

better organization
(→ good ideas need to be
glued together

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Good job setting out criteria
for who deserve ~~strokes~~ strokes
(→ not necessarily correct but you have
her right idea

Things that could have helped up
Second strike capabilities, what happens
if there's a revolution in Iran?, why
are nukes different?, Game theory

Second Opposition

you were talking about the
security dilemma, good.
rebuilt well, more refutation
would have been cool

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Kathleen Butler

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5 Room: M130

PROPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia TD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

David Denhoff Christian Taylor

Score
78
100

Score
78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Newfoundland PP

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Christoph Pike Leo Plumer

Score
81
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

156
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

161
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Defined terms well
outlined case well
Great polished presentation
needed more analysis

Second Proposition

Strong presentation
Great examples

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Strong refutation - like
how you used extension of
side propositions argument against
them ... human rights could be
ignored in sovereign states.
Strong presentation

Second Opposition

Good content - collective
security trumps sovereign rights
- WW example great of level
playing field doesn't stop wars

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: José Judel

No. of Judges: 2

Round: 5

Room: 130

PROPOSITION

Team Name: BC TD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

David Denhoff

Christina Taylor

Score
79
100

Score
79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Newfoundland PP

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Christoph Pike

Leo Plummer

Score
80
100

Score
82
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

158
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

162
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

—1 for very, very, very long POI's

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Both sides did not do very much to support their concept of rights, nor did they attack the other sides position on rights. In regard to ~~stability~~ "stability," both presented decent material but Prop failed to rest some important lines of argumentation that was presented by opp. (an stable fault support by Royan actors, etc.)

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jeff Prusky

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: M130

PROPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia - TD

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

David Denhoff

Christian Taylor

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>75</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Newfoundland - PP

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Christopher Pike

Leo Plummer

Score
<u>81</u>
100

Score
<u>79</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

<u>152</u>
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

<u>160</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Main point was constantly made clear, but not much explanation or analysis to really give it strong support.
- Too long on POIs.
- Good rebuttal.

Second Proposition

- Wanted to hear more on your points, but solid support for partner and good refutation.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Strong, confident style with great articulation.
- Great breakdown of themes to get to the crux of the matter.
- Nice respect of "Give 2 / Take 2"

Second Opposition

- Very interesting main arguments... wish you could've elaborated more! S
- Solid reconstruction, thought you had more to say.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Isabelle Fahmy

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 3 Room: L309

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Team Name: SK-WX

Team Name: ON-NM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tason Xiao

Chris Waddell

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kaitlyn Meloche

Norman Nehmetallah

Score
83
100

Score
82
100

Score
77
100

Score
76
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

165
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

153
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: R. Smith

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: L309

PROPOSITION

Team Name: SK. WX

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jason Xias

Chris Waddell

Score
84.
100

Score
81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ont N M

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kaitlyn Meloche

Norman Nehmetalla

Score
79
100

Score
78 79
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

165
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

157 158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Jason

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Kaitlyn

Second Proposition

Chris

Second Opposition

Norman

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Kiara Kaminski

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3

Room: L319

PROPOSITION

Team Name: SK-WX

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jason Xiao

Chris Waddell

Score
<u>88</u>
100

Score
<u>88</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario NM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kaitlyn Meloche

Norman Nehoretallah

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

<u>164</u>
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

<u>154</u>
200

PROPOSITION X OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

In round

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Will Hiscock

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M137

PROPOSITION

Team Name: MB HL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Daniel Huang

Allen Liu

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: SK ZK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kelly Zheng

Rainer Kocsis

Score
73
100

Score
76
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

150
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

149
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

✓
Note other
2 judges
disagreed.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alex Amor

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 3rd Set Room: 137

PROPOSITION

Team Name: MB HL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Daniel

Allen

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>74</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sask ZK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kelly

Rainer

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

<u>151</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>152</u>
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

PMR needed clearer causal links.

- 1) What does it mean to have a right?
- 2) Why does the exercise of that right imply that there will be less terrorism?
- 3) Good

PMR was rhetorically compelling but a little hard to follow.

Second Proposition

Tell me how? Tell me why?
How does the program collapse under opp?

2-1 SPLIT

in favour of opp.

LOP needed more engagement.

Second Opposition

Construct first - your argument's impact was diminished by how it was foreshadowed.

be careful with your examples - they can sometimes undermine your credibility.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Reena Smith

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 1137

PROPOSITION

Team Name: MB - HL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Daniel Huang

allen Liu

Score
72
100

Score
72
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sask - ZK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kelly Zheng

Rainer Kosis

Score
73
100

Score
75
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

149
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

148
200

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Roadmap + define

→ use proper facts

Second Proposition

→ use proper facts

Roadmap

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Roadmap.

→ use proper facts

Second Opposition

one good point but should
have been followed through
more.

→ use proper facts

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: G. BUEGER

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M329

PROPOSITION

Team Name: QUEBEC T.O.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

DAN TON-THAT

JEREMY OBRAND

Score
75
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: B.C. M.S.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

JULIA MILDEN

ZACK SANTELLA

Score
84
100

Score
83
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score	151
	200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score	167
	200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

"INSTIGATION" WAS STRETCHED OUT TO THE EXTENT OF SIGNIFICANT REPETITION

SELF-DEFENSE IS A LEGITIMATE POINT, BUT NON-PROLIFERATION ≠ DISARMAMENT WHO THREATENS IRAN? (AVADA? REALLY?)

Second Proposition

ENERGETIC + ARTICULATE PRESENTATION, BUT WEAK GRASP OF FACTS (CANADA DOESN'T RELY ON IRANIAN OIL; EUROPE DOES)

IS YOUR CASE ADEQUATELY SUMMARIZED, "LET'S NOT STAND UP TO THE BAD GUYS, BECAUSE WE'RE AFRAID OF THEM"?

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

IT'S RUDE (IN MY VIEW) TO VERBALLY INTERRUPT A SPEECH BY SAYING POI ALOUD - WE KNOW YOU WISH A POI WHEN YOU STAND + GESTURE

GENERALLY A SOLID UNDERSTANDING OF IRAN, THOUGH YOU MEAN POST-1979 IRAN (YOU ~~USE~~ USED THE WORD "NEVER" HYPERBOLICALLY)

Second Opposition

EFFECTIVE ANALOGY re GUNS

THE TERMS "COLD WAR" AND "ARMS RACE" EMERGED IN THE FINAL MINUTE — THEY SHOULD HAVE BEEN EMPLOYED EARLIER. THE OTHER HISTORICAL REFERENCE (WHICH WAS CONSPICUOUS BY ITS ABSENCE) SHOULD HAVE BEEN "APPEASEMENT"

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: COLE BRICKER

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5 Room: _____

PROPOSITION

Team Name: QC TO

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Dan Ton-That

Jeremy Obana

Score
77
100

Score
77
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC M.S.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Julia Milden

Zack Santella

Score
83
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

154
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

163
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Opposition

RFD: Prop never proved why Iran has a right to nuclear weapons, opp proves that global situation would be more dangerous if Iran had weapons. A dearth of facts/knowledge on both sides, while it did not heavily influence decisions not mentioning the NPT or MAD was problematic. opp proved that Iran was not deserving of nukes ~~and that self-defence was a particularly weak justification~~ given that that Iran was responsible for their current situation.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Simon

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 329

PROPOSITION

Team Name: QC-TO

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Dan Ton-that

Jeremy Obrand

Score
75
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC-MS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Julia Milden

Zack Santella

Score
89
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

150
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

154
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Good speech, but grasp
of facts somewhat lacking

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: JAMES PHELAN

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 344

PROPOSITION

Team Name: SASIC - SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nasra Mounim Areeb Salim

Score
89
100

Score
87
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: OW - KIK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tae-Ha Kim Angen Kwok

Score
90
100

Score
90
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

176
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

180
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Like, whoa.

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Holly Kallmeyer

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M344

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sask-SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nasra Moumin

Areeh Salim

Score
88
100

Score
86
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario-KK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tae-Hu Kim

Anson Kwok

Score
90
100

Score
88
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

174
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

178
200

PROPOSITION X OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

• Integrate more rights
analysis into the
rebuttal speech, perhaps

YOU WERE ALL
OUTSTANDING.
More POIs, perhaps.

Second Proposition

• Refutation on opp's point about the
optics of nuclear possession by
other ~~states~~ countries could have
been more developed

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Penne/

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M344

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Sask SM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Nasm Mounin

Areeb Salim

Score
88
100

Score
85
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Ontario KK

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tae-Oh Kim

Anson Kwok

Score
90
100

Score
92
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

173
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

182
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Oral feedback. ~~Also, see me for comments/RFO.~~
I will find the teams and give the RFO
Best HS round I have ever seen... (and, I've seen many).

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Lorelie DeRose

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M342

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec GB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Megan Gagliano Karen Butt

Score
73
100

Score
71
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: British Columbia AR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Madeline Armstrong Sorani Rai

Score
76
100

Score
76
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

144
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

152
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

watch use of 'like' 'things'
'stuff'
some good analysis, just
need more depth of analysis
and knowledge.

Second Proposition

work on vocabulary, flow,
don't say 'like' every other
word
- weathers the good ideas you
have
- have a clearer constructive
point
- work on developing more
constructive material

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

explore why should not have
right. why now in different class
of 'rights'

Second Opposition

good knowledge + understanding of
situation. Good reference
but need more constructive
points

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: J. Schuman

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M 342

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec CB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Megan Daigian Karen Brett

Score
75
100

Score
73
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC AR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Madeline Armstrong Sonam Rai

Score
85
100

Score
87
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score	148
	200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score	17.2
	200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Wider arguments.

Second Proposition

You needed your own
argument.
Watch use of "like"

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Good job on presenting case
& widening the context
for the opposition during
your

Second Opposition

well organized both in
refutation & constructive
arguments. Clear
Speaker

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Evan Weiser

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M 342

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec GB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Megan Baglione

Karen Bott

Score
72
100

Score
70
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: BC AR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Madeline Armstrong

Saman Rai

Score
74
100

Score
74
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

142
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

148
200

PROPOSITION OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

• Never wait too far in your explanation
of points
• Good

Second Proposition

• Need to actually have a point
• Gay like legs - liked the Mad principle

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

• Liked point and how threat is kept
• Did satisfactory refutation

Second Opposition

• Good knowledge
• need to have a constructive point

More comments in round

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: William Onyeji

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M-334

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec CM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Daniel Mercant

Melissa Cape

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Score
<u>75</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta JV

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zach Shapiro

Christopher Virtue

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

<u>151</u>
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>163</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Model was too broad

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Very clear and
concise

Second Proposition

Better reputation
and rebuilding
of partner's material
~~is~~ is needed

Second Opposition

Spend less time
on ~~re~~ rhetoric;
Keep careful note
of your time

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: VIRGINIA ROBERTSON

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M 334

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec CM

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

David Marcovitch Melissa Cape

Score
77
100

Score
75
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta SV

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Zack Shapiro Christopher Virtue

Score
83
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

152

200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

160

200

163

PROPOSITION

OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition - David

- The house = international community = sovereignty issue
- internal operations within a country should not be interfered with by other countries
- Iran has the right to make their own decisions
- vague analysis of the issue
- not clear + repetitive at times
- filled time but not effectively

Rebuttal/Summary - summarized viewpoints well.

- competent speaker

Second Proposition - Melissa

- good point "paper tiger" theory
- "safe" for Iran to have nuclear weapons
- handled question (POI)
- not really a logical argument
- restated what 1st proposition speaker stated

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition - Zack

- good question (POI)
- addressed first proposition viewpoints
- good examples presented
- "cold war" dynamics → no resolution from stockpiling weapons → good point!
- "peace through fear" → long term ineffective
- "authoritarianism" is bad
- good "POI" brought up

Rebuttal/Summary

- logical conclusions
- organized + clear
- people have the right to interfere in other countries because of track record
- "greater safety of the world"

Second Opposition - Christopher

- refuted points made by proposition
- showed that proposition was stating conflicting points of view
- constructed relevant arguments
- showed possible dangers of Iran having nuclear weapons
- addressed questions from opposition
- good points made + explained

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: C. Kusel

No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: M 334

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Qc CM

First Speaker: D. Marcovitch Second Speaker: M. Cape

Score
<u>76</u>
100

Score
<u>75</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta SV

First Speaker: Z. Shapiro Second Speaker: C. Virtue

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

<u>151</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>163</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Put your paper down
- Who are you - who is we
- Is there a case / plan?
- "We ~~did~~ went to Iraq "over chemical weapons" - who??
- Getting to some good examples only at the end of your speech - Vietnam too bad you ran out of time.

Second Proposition

Paper Tiger Theory: argues for nuclear weapons & not just their right

Still need to define who "we" are
• Good emotion

How do we know they are going to use them? Where is your proof that they will not?

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

1st POI - Good one - They did ~~cancel~~ their point. - sometimes intervene but not this case

Who is "we?"

Great style/eye contact.

- I like your Korean argument.
- why no cold war dynamic - link it back to resolution
- wait quietly for POI

Second Opposition

• Hands out of pocket.

Refutation:

- Let prop ask question before dismissing him.

• Good knowledge - work on explaining yourself clearly.

Recklessness - Not a strong argument ~~verses~~ their right - so if they are careful it is OK. partners

his house believes that Iran has a right to develop nuclear weapons

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: John Buty

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5 Room: 328

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba - HW.

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anthony

Michael Herke

Score
85.
100

Score
79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: AB - RL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Joan Rowley

Tasas Leung

Score
86
100

Score
84.
100

GREAT DEBATE!

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

164
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

170.
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- seemed to but did not prove recognition would yield behavior change.
- clever proposal that giving recognition through legitimizing weapons will change behavioral patterns & transparency could come of this → pragmatic arg.
- fluid, powerful, quick thinking
- "great clash."
- late entry of hypocrisy argument →
- though clever, tried to force own belief that
- pragmatic

Second Proposition

Michael

- late entry of hypocrisy argument →
- balance of power argument
- self preservation → pragmatic arg. → Hiroshima eg. → mutually assured destruction
- can't stop them so find something
- not equal somehow eliminates
- 'right' did not deal with this nearly enough
- central clash from opp!

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Joan

- good strategy of focusing on 'right' & on likelihood that Iran is unstable.
- fluid & powerful, quick thinking
- well clashed.
- U.N. won't work. → good Israel interp.

Second Opposition

Tasas

- went back to what U.N.'s premise for existence is as reference point.
- U.N. → pragmatic for balance negated by principals. → need to act against Iran.
- well clashed using solid foundation
- legitimacy. → solidifies internal power. → hate speech.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Amir Khouram

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M 328

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba - HW

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anthony Wightman Michael Horke

Score
85
100

Score
84
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta - RL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Joan Rowledge Jason Lam

Score
86
100

Score
85
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

169
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

171
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Slow down your speech
- Good organization and signposting throughout first speech
- good P.O.I's. Careful of use of facts.
- careful of our extending yourself in the final speech by addressing opp's themes as well.

Second Proposition

- Clearly define your point, separate from rebuttal.
- Good use of P.O.I's

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Excellent speeches.
- Fully flesh out rebuttal: stated the plan was not practical, but would have fully, more thoroughly explained lack of practicality.
- Good synthesis in final speech

Second Opposition

- Excellent P.O.I's.
- Careful of factual evidence: ie, Indian use of Condo reactor: this actually led to India's nuclear weapons program.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Lyle Dobbin

No. of Judges: 3

Round: M15 Room: M328

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Manitoba - HW

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Anthony Wightman Michael Honke

Score
83 81
100

Score
76 78
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: AB-RL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Joel Rowledge Jason Lomb

Score
85
100

Score
79
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

159
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

164
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Solid Pragmatic framework
- Accept that Iran is a pirarah, how can we best manage that
- Any time the topic has the word "right" in it, you need a normative argument

Second Proposition

- Introduction of MAD, good relevant knowledge demonstration
- If they will develop nukes either way, why would they do it on our terms?

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Nuclear non-proliferation!!! Excellent
- Argument about stability was well outlined
- Feel free to talk in more blunt terms, IR is fun when you understand it well

Second Opposition

- Regional stability argument best illustrated in this speech
- Didn't buy legitimacy, that's just me.
- Good luck!

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Melisse C. Drogos

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5 Room: A230

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ON - KC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Elliot Kaufman Daniel Chiang

Score
82
100

Score
83
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NWT - HS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Greg Hanna

Emily Smith

Score
75
100

Score
74
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

165
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

149
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:

First Proposition

- Well introduced & defined
- massive military neighbors; good!
- ↳ geo-political
- M&D - Cold War; good example
- Poal well dealt with
- reaching an impasse - good point
- Well summarized.

3 theme boil down - good!

Second Proposition

- Very well introduced
- explanations well organized and explained/supported
- Poal very well dealt with
- being realistic - good statement
- diplomacy - great!
- Strong speech.

• Strong Poal

Judge's Comments:

First Opposition

- Good Poal - neither having nuclear weapons
- Well introduced - captivating
- Well mapped out, well organized
- Solid rebuttal
- Poal well dealt with
- Make the change between points clearer - i.e. between rebuttal and your constructive aspect.

2 question boil down - good

Second Opposition

- Well organized
- Good rebuttal - try to include more clash with prop's statements
- environment
- tensions created
- try to give more concrete examples to elaborate your statements/explanation

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Louise Chalmer No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: 230

PROPOSITION

Team Name: DN - KC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Elliot Kaufman Daniel Chang

Score
81
100

Score
81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NWT - HS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Greg Hanna Emily Smith

Score
79
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

162
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Clearly stated + explained position
good team work.

works through all the opp's points
thorough.

Second Proposition

very articulate speaker
logical argumentation
effective rebuttal of opp's points.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Nice style! Good clash. Very effective
reputation - Is Iran provoked? Speaker.
alternatives - diplomacy, alternative weaponry

Contradiction in your argument FOR
diplomacy + cited Iran's record on not
being diplomatic.
☒ Effective use of POI's

Second Opposition

Must argue beyond personal
belief.
Stumbling for arguments at end
of speech.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Jake Roth

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M230

PROPOSITION

Team Name: ONKL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Elliot Kaufman Daniel Chiam

Score
<u>73</u>
100

Score
<u>74</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NWTHS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Greg Hanna Emily Smith

Score
<u>70</u>
100

Score
<u>70</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

<u>147</u>
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

<u>140</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Why does the international community as per your model have an interest in recognizing Iran's right to nuclear arms? - why does the "U.S. threat" exist?
- This case/fear of Iran is not based on attention. (just a sidenote)
- You need to tell me more about why Iran feels provoked.
- Your speech didn't demonstrate substantial harms of the status quo.

Second Proposition

- Try not to ask a PoI about their weakest material (i.e. Japan in World War II). - Re-build, don't restate your partner's arguments.
- Good job pointing out the real world context!
- ~~Remember~~ - Iran as preservationists was a smart argument.
- "What's to stop Iran from not honoring its agreements if the U.S. gives up its nukes?"
Yes, that makes sense. Good point!

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- You talk about Iran's extreme views, yet you then go on to talk about domestic social policy. How is that ~~relevant~~ ~~relevant~~ relevant to the international community?
- Mid-way through your speech, you introduced a counter-case (NO nuclear arms). That is not what this debate is about!
- Good job talking about how Iran provokes other countries.
- Very little of your speech dealt with Iran. As such, you missed the spirit of the motion.

Second Opposition

- Way more refutation needed
- The environmental argument was not relevant to the motion. This human security argument is good, but just not in this debate.
- You needed a much more nuanced analysis of nuclear arms races.
- "They're difficult to enforce sometimes." You're kind of conceding your case here.
- Needed to engage with the other team

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Howard

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 5

Room: M2

PROPOSITION

Team Name: KM - Quebec

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Emily Mcheln

Emma Katz

Score
78
100

Score
76
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Sashaknewen TR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Gulraiz Tariq

Abdul Rahman

Score
75
100

Score
80
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

155
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

ACTORS (explained)
Irreals

- strong argument re nuclear umbrella, Cold War
- work on engaging directly with the notion → RIGHT to nuclear arms.
- i.e. explain why your argument leads to a conclusion that they should have nuclear arms

Second Proposition

- Great responses to P's
- try to explain causal links
- (ex: "by intervening, we allow them to become more corrupt" → why?
- "nukes = sovereignty" → why?

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- bad govt = bad IR → why?
- work on clarity organization

Second Opposition

- best understanding of situation
- discussion of sanctions & right taking = interesting analysis
- had a lot of good ideas
- try to better structure rebuttal

REF = Close Round. Opposition had a stronger understanding of the geo-political realities. They win by sufficiently convincing us that Iran will use nukes, & that rights are contingent on intl security. Discussion about threatening weak countries was strong.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Matt Blundell

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 6336

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec BR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sarah

Sabrina

Score
<u>77</u>
100

Score
<u>72</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS-FB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Aislin

Clairissa

Score
<u>87</u>
100

Score
<u>82</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

<u>154</u>
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

149

Team
Score

<u>169</u>
200

169

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Circular logic
repetitive

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

good case

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Lewis Farnar

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: L336

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec BR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sarah Battat

Sabrina Roy

Score
77
100

Score
72
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: New Brunswick NS-FB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Aislin Flynn

Clarissa Brisson

Score
87
100

Score
82
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

149
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

169
200

PROPOSITION OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Michael Muir

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: L336

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec - BR

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Sarah Battat

Sabrina Roy

Score
77
100

Score
72.
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: NS - FB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Aiden Flynn

Clarissa Brisseau

Score
87
100

Score
82.
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

149
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

169
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Try to analyse your arguments more deeply rather than repeating the same ideas a number of times.
Please slow down and moderate your voice more to allow your listeners to fully understand your material.

Second Proposition

Logic of "Sacrifice" argument was not compelling as it was presented.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Great analysis, well organised
Very effective POIs

Second Opposition

Good analysis of an important constructive point.
Good refutation and reconstruction
Try to be more actively involved in POI process (give more!).

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alex Chalk

No. of Judges: 1

Round: 3 Room: M133

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Newfoundland - WN

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Kate McNail Morgan Walsh

Score
79
100

Score
79
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Nova Scotia - DS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

William Dawson Rebecca Sutton

Score
84
100

Score
81
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

158
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

165
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Comments
given
orally

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: J. Burg

No. of Judges: _____ Round: 5 Room: _____

PROPOSITION

Team Name: Quebec LS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Jenna Shapiro

Eric Laurin

Score
77
100

Score
72
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta KC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Stephen Cho

Alif Karmali

Score
81
100

Score
83
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information

Team
Score

149
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

164
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Second Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Doug Neal

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: 132

PROPOSITION

Team Name: QC LS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Tanna Shapiro Eric Laurin

Score
<u>75</u>
100

Score
<u>72</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: Alberta KC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Stephen Cho Alif Karmali

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>82</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

<u>147</u>
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

<u>162</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

- Vary tone & speed of voice and speech.

Second Proposition

- Could have use Pakistan & N. Korea instead of Russia
- Need to refute more
- POI's ?

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- A bit too much reading
- Lacked a bit of coherence

Second Opposition

- Too much reading
- A few excellent POI's.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Alan Strand

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M132

PROPOSITION

Team Name: OC LS

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Janna Shapiro

Eric Laurin

Score
<u>80</u>
100

Score
<u>79</u>
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ABKC

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Stephen Cho

Alif Kamali

Score
<u>81</u>
100

Score
<u>83</u>
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

<u>159</u>
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

<u>164</u>
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

Second Proposition

Second Opposition

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Romeo

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: N326

PROPOSITION

Team Name: NS - OB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Debi Ogunrinde Oliver Bjornsson

Score
83
100

Score
82
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ON UL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Denizhan Uykur Valentin Catin

Score
80
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team Score

165
200

This round was won by the (please circle):

Team Score

158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Avoid making sweeping generalizations in IR motions: Iran & Israel will be great allies, US will be seen as an impartial mediator etc.

Second Proposition

Solid constructive arguments, not enough direct refutation of the "principled" stuff from LO.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

You did well playing ball with a twist on the case, but you need to challenge the assumptions they set forth: No military strike will be useful, sanctions aren't working.

Second Opposition

Bring back the "principled" case a bit more, if you're going to emphasize it so much.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: Emma O'Rourke-Friel

No. of Judges: 3

Round: 5

Room: M326

PROPOSITION

Team Name: NS-GB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Debi Ogunrinde Oliver Bjornsson

Score
83
100

Score
81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ON-UL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Denizhan Uyker Valentin Litvin

Score
79
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

164
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

157
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

A few troubling assertions that marred what was otherwise an excellent case → ① liberalization will necessarily occur after increased contact w/ west (unlikely & unsubstantiated) & ② you can have diplomacy between Israel & Iran if they both have nukes. Given regime change is unlikely,

Second Proposition how does this happen?

interesting point about China! would have perhaps benefitted from more refutation.

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

The just war theory seemed a little out of place in the round. Don't concede that Iran has/will soon have nukes! Alternatively, opp w/ assassinating scientists.

Second Opposition

point about image of Iranian ~~people~~ people was bizarre given that Iran is not a democracy. Excellent refutation, however.

Canadian National Debating Championships

Judge's Name: John Robinson No. of Judges: 3 Round: 5 Room: M 326

PROPOSITION

Team Name: NS-OB

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Debi Ogunrinde

Oliver Bjornsson

Score
83
100

Score
81
100

OPPOSITION

Team Name: ON-UL

First Speaker:

Second Speaker:

Denizhan Uykur

Valentin Litvin

Score
80
100

Score
78
100

Please consider: Content, Style, Strategy and Points of Information.

Team
Score

164
200

This round was won
by the (please circle):

Team
Score

158
200

PROPOSITION / OPPOSITION

Judge's Comments:
First Proposition

Good rebuttal
Great delivery
Good approach - it is inevitable
Some points were a bit too optimistic
e.g. US will be accepted as mediator

Second Proposition

Good delivery
Good attacks
China point worked
Should say more about why regime change
was unlikely to work well - next
leader more radical

Judge's Comments:
First Opposition

- Tricky to deal with what seemed to
be unexpected practical case
- Attack more of the assumptions
→ V. Good delivery

Second Opposition

- Expand attacks
→ ~~attack some of their~~
→ could attack some of their assumptions
e.g. US would be accepted as mediator
from by Iran.