

The Final Round Decisions

Adjudicators

Scott Jensen, Webster University
Robert Margesson, Humboldt State University
J. Nelson, Nebraska
Marcus Paroske, University of Pittsburgh
Sharon Porter, Northern Arizona University
Scott Rodriguez, California State U. — San Bernadino
Daniel Schabot, Cumberland College
Bill Sheffield, Lewis-Clark State College
Matt Stannard, University of Wyoming

Decisions

Scott Jensen
Webster University

The Opposition team, from Utah did the better job of debating.

This is a fabulous final round. It is so perfect that we are evaluating ideas of dialogue and criticism of policy within the context of our activity. And all four debaters personify the best of who we are and the importance of being able to think and argue critically. Thank you for a great round.

I wish both teams had provided a thorough comparison of these two ideals. I think this debate could have been even richer in its critique of what we are comparing had the focus not been so strongly on US action/ideals. That being said, I vote for the Government-case position. I get a better comparison of ideals - something I think the resolution calls for - with this analysis. There is excellent clash on the justification of looking philosophical underpinnings v. effects of ideals, but no real take out of the argument that individual's sovereignty is upheld and nourished within the US context. The notion that this happens with no tie to government or religious institution is compelling as a comparison to Islamic fundamentalism. The market place of ideas is mitigated, but Opposition extends the analysis with the education of women and current dialogue here and elsewhere. The examples of debate and dialog, while mitigated somewhat, still stand as clear distinctions between US patriotism and is Fund.

On case - the ego of Nicaragua, Columbia & War in Afghan are compelling. But the link to United States patriotism never really answered regarding Columbia & Afghan. Government wins Nicaragua, but does not adequately prove to me the patriotism link with regards to the other two.

That we criticize government row flows to the Opposition. While I grant that we often are too reticent as a country with regards to our critiques, there are clearly more opponents with US patriotism than with Islamic fundamentalism.

The definition/criteria debate, then, is important. The Opposition answers/analysis that I needed more Government clash toward and that the resolutions list two ideas - implying an ideological comparison. While the ethnocentrism arguments are strong and dropped - so too is that United States action (The impacts that would get a Government ballot) is based on realistic interests. I also am persuaded by the Leader of Opposition claims that critical discourse is better promoted by the Opposition standard. Either way, the Leader of Opposition rebuttal continues to press for the patriotism link to the Prime Minister and I never hear this answered.

*Robert Margesson
Humboldt State University*

The Government team from Alaska did the better job debating.

Reason for Decision:

1. Impacts versus ideology—The Opposition puts a lot of eggs in this basket and it is unfortunate that something as trite as dropped arguments kicks it out of the round. But Joelle drops four responses out of the Member of Government and each gives me justification to side Gov here.
2. Case debate—The only real issue on case is the case debate. Again, I am forced to look at dropped arguments. The Member of Government discusses the role that public opinion plays in mandating policy. This goes conceded. I am even given the example of the Vietnam conflict and the Member of Opposition neglects that as well. So, I see a clear causal link on my flow, finally on case. I pull through multiple impacts for the Gov and these impacts are the conceded criterion for the debate.

Realism—I got to tell you that I really struggle with this. Joelle asks me to extend the realism position and honestly it's not on my flow. In the Leader of Opposition's rebuttal, I am told it was brought out in the overview and then it is given the vote able analysis. Based strictly on my flow I can't justify weighing the counter causality issue as a voter.

J. Nelson
Nebraska

The Government team from Alaska did the better job of debating.

Congratulations of the accomplishment on Finals at NPDA! You were both exceptional teams and the debate was more than worthy of the final round. That out of the way ☺, I think the fundamental voters all derived from dropped analysis. On face, the redefinition makes sense to me and I think there are clear answers for the Member of Government's constructive responses; however, those answers are not made. Islamic fundamentalism ideology is sort of answered else where on the flow, but never developed and applied to the redefinition debate. So, I am remaining under the Government's definition. Therefore, the majority of the off-case becomes moot. The only off case that applies on case (thus, relevant to the debate) is media. This flows Government because of the Member of Government's constructive unanswered analysis by the Member of Opposition constructive. I am left with United States' foreign policy. Is there alternate causality to United States' foreign policy? Yes. Does it outweigh patriotism as the primary cause in the examples provided? Government sufficiently answers "No." Columbia goes relatively untouched by the Opposition and this argument flows to the Government. War on terror is very clearly the case of U.S. patriotism gone amok (my word, not the Government's — they say unending and continual hunt, Bush rhetoric supports)! Then the Opposition actually asks me to LOOK AT THE EFFECTS & THEIR MPX (Member of Opposition constructive response #3 to patriotic justification). So, I'm give no further justification for the Government definition.

Finally, we have Nicaragua. I am buying the Opposition's political realism until the Member of Government's constructive arguments of 1) attitude of suppression was present and 2) justification of USP being cause is present in the oppressive sanctions, go dropped. Then, I have to flow USFP influence by USP in these instances. By taking these three examples and their damage/violence resulting, then comparing the one IF example (9/11) and its damage/violence resulting, I am left with the conclusion that U.S. patriotism is no better than Islamic fundamentalism. Gov wins!

Marcus Paroske
University of Pittsburgh

The Opposition team from Utah did the better job of debating.

- 1) Is the round to be adjudicated by looking to effect or ideology?
Clearly, this issue is key to the round. It is nearly impossible for the Gov to win that, at an ideological level, US foreign policy is motivated by the same beliefs as Islamic Fundamentalism. Even a cursory examination of the competing schools of thought demonstrates this. The opposition, as pointed out by the Gov, provides cursory of the ideological roots of Fundamentalism, but even that is enough to demonstrate this intuitive disconnect between the two. However, the MOC does drop a series of crucial MGC reasons to prefer the standard of effects over ideology and its application in the real world. I will weigh this round on the effects of USFP abroad.

- 2) Is USFP primarily motivated by patriotism or realism?
Even if the effects of USFP mirror those of Islamic Fundamentalist FP, the Opp rightly asserts that a link must be demonstrated between those acts and a motivation of patriotism. Otherwise, it is US "strategic interests" that mirror IF, not patriotism. Here, the debate could have used more clash. The realism arguments from Opp are largely dropped by Gov, except for a new application of the "real world" criteria argument. Still, Gov stresses the causing that without substantial US popular support (i.e. patriotic allegiance), then these oppressive foreign policies are not viable strategies. Then, the analysis moves to a series of examples that have good rationales supporting both interpretations. Nicaragua, dissent proven by this round, Columbia, Chomsky, all even out on both sides. What I am troubled by is the lack of adequate Gov response to the "US public is apathetic to FP" argument, which is not adequately addressed. LOR does a masterful job of using this fact to cause doubt in my mind to the link between patriotism and USFP. Without a more dedicated effort by Gov to justify patriotism money, more importantly critique lies as in the course, then I cannot uphold the resolution.

I have encountered my fair share of NPDA final rounds in my life, and I honestly believe this is one of the finest I have seen. Great clash, excellent oratory, and of the best damn LOR's I have ever seen. It pains me to have to pick a winner. These debaters are a testament to the activity and the pedagogical possibilities of Parliamentary debate. It was an honor to judge you.

Sharon Porter
Northern Arizona University

The Government team from Alaska did the better job of debating.

This was a very enjoyable round. Initially I felt the opposition had the right idea in arguing that we should be looking at the philosophical underpinnings of the two issues. However this became a difficult process without looking to the effects. The dropped arguments and analysis especially, "not how this is done in the real world" tilted this point to the government. Similarly I was initially persuaded that perhaps Gov was not making the link between foreign policy and patriotism but in the last analysis the argument that foreign policy would not continue without patriotism-especially Vietnam overturned my original position.

The next compelling argument for me was the ICJ conviction and that we cannot accept we could be wrong.

Scott Rodriguez
California State U. — San Bernadino

The Opposition team from Utah did the better job of debating.

I recognize that my ballot is going to more than a bit queer, but you have all come to expect that from me by now I am sure!!

Reason for Decision: The Government wins criteria on effects because the Opposition cannot explain why ideological underpinnings should be weighed if they are being ignored. On effects, Gov wins that both U.S. patriotism and Islam fundamentalism are guilty of "polarizing." However, the Opposition also wins a crucial difference between these two "isms" - their treatment of women!! This argument is *terribly* underemphasized in the round by both sides, but at least it is mentioned by the Opp, while the Gov ignores it entirely. It would have been possible for the Gov to argue that U.S. treats women just as bad or worse as Islamic fund. But this is not attempted. Since women are 52% of all people on earth, I view this as the biggest impact in there. Leave it to the female debater to actually be the one who notices this point!!

Daniel Schabot
Cumberland College

The Government team from Alaska did the better job of debating.
Reason for Decision:

- (1) Philosophy. I believe that the Gov does a better job providing a holistic view of their (the effects) side than the Opp does on theirs (cause). The Gov provides clear stories about how in the past and now patriotism provides real-world effects that are as bad or worse than Islamic fundamentalism. The Opp provides wonderful rhetoric about U.S. founding principles, but the link to patriotism is un-clear.
- (2) Gov Criteria: The Gov spends a great deal of time showing how Patriotic favor causes the U.S. to compromise its base philosophy to the point of creating worse effects than Islamic fundamentalism. The Opp needed to explain how with patriotism the U.S. manages to uphold philosophical underpinnings. At the point Opp makes realism a voter then opens themselves up to this burden as pointed out by the Gov.

Bill Sheffield
Lewis-Clark State College

The Government team from Alaska did the better job of debating.

I find myself having to clear my flow up a little in making a decision, but hopefully not at the sake of intervention. With that said, here's what it came down to for me:

Case: Gov't wins major case issue Re: US Actions; Gov't is consistent in advocating that US ignore international criticism of inconsistent actions. OPP fails to respond to this claim. Case, for the most part, is not extended by LOR. The link story to patriotism is clearly argued by Gov't when they say that foreign policy is driven by and relies on public support, hence patriotism. Also, extension of case under view is important;

Criteria/Top of Of Case: The issue of how I am to look at this round is important to this round. There are two levels: 1) Gov't says criteria is damage and violence. I get these examples on Gov't case, which is won by Gov't (as mentioned above). 2) Opp says O.K., but also look at ideological issue. The Gov't takes the argument with several responses not addressed by Opp. PMR extends that its ethnocentric viewpoint, it is not how we do it in the real world, and that we do not follow ideology in the real world. All this coupled with level #1 and Opp grants we look at this on effects, I must vote for Alaska.

Congratulations to both for a well-deserved showing in the final round.

Matt Stannard
University of Wyoming

The Government team from Alaska did the better job of debating.

Congratulations to both teams for three long days at this logistical nightmare. You represent the best our activity has to offer. Criteria should serve to tell me what to do if both sides are winning some things. Neither side does this. No "even if" analysis until LOR

The Member of Opp concedes most of the arguments against ideology criteria. Ethnocentrism, etc. The only question is weighing realism/alt, causality versus patriotism as the engine of US foreign policy. The problem is twofold: First, LOC only blips out "realism as alternate cause," while M. Gov does a great deal at work explaining approval ratings, patriotism as mandate, and even that patriotism leads to American apathy regarding the international community's moral judgments against us. "without our support," Mr. Garcia argues, "they wouldn't be doing it." True or not, Opp ignores this argument.

Conceding contention II was also a big mistake for Opp. This nearly served as an independent warrant for Gov. and at least a tie breaker. Conversely, Opp's libertarianism position gives away because Opp drops criteria answers, as discussed above.