**NPF**

**FLIP: 26 Nimbkar - Rivera v. 25 Lomax - Cobb**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octo-Finals</th>
<th>Ethan Fiber ('29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 321</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Rivera 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Nimbkar 28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Cobb 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Lomax 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro** (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

**Judge's Signature**

Desert Vista

School / Affiliation / Occupation

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

EU = European Union
UN = United Nations

The US *is* in the UN

Neg - y'all didn't use prep for rebuttal or summary, you shall
Both sides - use the entire length of your speeches, 20-30 sec early endings just limit your args

So, the neg plays this super risky game of advocating that what the aff is advocating for is good, but we shouldn't do it to the extent they're advocating for. The problem is the negative's advocacy is the status quo, not a reduction, therefore, even if you prove that lowering is preferential to abolishing, it doesn't matter because that's not the actual advocacy of the neg. Because of that, all the aff has to prove to win the debate is that abolishing is preferable to the status quo, and they can easily do that when you basically present all args + warrants as the negative. Because of that, the neg basically gives me no active reason to negate.
Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kevin Puliam</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Logan Goswick</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Anika Desai</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Rinal Pand</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff. use of evidence was fantastic. Both speakers utilized cited pieces of evidence at crucial points in argument. Neg. failed provide enough evidence to counter the claim by aff. that cutting capital gains tax would create more money for jobs. Ass. demonstrated that all less taxes would help the lower class offset poverty and reduce mortality rate.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Crossfire (1 & 2): 3 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Crossfire (3 & 4): 3 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 2 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min
- 2 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
**C** **H** **I** **S** **T** **I** **, A** **A** **M** **R** **A** **H**  

**Schugardt, Shan**

**NPF**

**Bobcat Bonanza 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Aamirah Chisti (*10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Octo-Finals</td>
<td>Room 305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Budruk</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Hsu</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Chen</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Kim</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**  
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **No**

---

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Pro**

Strong argument for the abolition of Cgt.  
Other country comparison should have statistical evidence w/o it's difficult to know for sure.

**Con**

Good agreement, concern over comparison of what would happen if all investors sold stock simultaneously. Need statistical evidence not opinion. Should broaden argument on health care.
Ms. Park - Speaking too fast. I like the use of definitions. Don't read and don't hold papers in front of your face. Need to gather down in long examples.

Mr. Sypher - Good Job backing up. Pause more but overall good pace. Watch your statistic citations. You said more than once that 90% of US citizens live in poverty. Nowhere near true. Could have been more. Good use of statistics to draw conclusions. Percentage of tax revenue represents.

Ms. Damir - Good body language but try not to sway. Overall good.
Argument more persuasive through better use of statistics and sources.

Pro side had sources, but I felt the statistics were cited by Ron were more persuasive.
**NPF**

**FLIP: 25 McHenry - Sadeqi v. 10 Shams - Islam**

**No Show**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Chad Ball (*'14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Octo-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 301</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Pro**    **Con**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ____

---

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

Speaker 1.................. 4 min  
Speaker 2.................. 4 min  
Crossfire (1 & 2) *........ 3 min  
Speaker 3.................. 4 min  
Speaker 4.................. 4 min  
Crossfire (3 & 4) *........ 3 min  
Speaker 1 Summary........ 2 min  
Speaker 2 Summary........ 2 min  
Grand Crossfire (all)..... 3 min  
Speaker 3 Final Focus..... 2 min  
Speaker 4 Final Focus..... 2 min  

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

---

25 McHenry - Sadeqi wins by forfeit.
### NPF

**FLIP: 47 Gay - Lu v. 7 Montefalcon - Epley**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Shannon Insalaco <em>(44)</em></th>
<th>Room 304</th>
<th>Sat 01/27/18 12:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Octo-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Shannon Insalaco</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 304</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sat 01/27/18 12:30PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Epley</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Montefalcon</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Lu</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- **Pro**
- **Con**

(Circle Winner)

**Is this a low point win?**

- **No**

**Judge's Signature**

25 41

---

**comments & reason for decision:**

- Why did you speak so quickly? You went like 3:30! Use your time!
- CZ seems like a corporate tax argument. Please clearly link to capital gains.
- Need more attacks in rebuttal that aren't cross applications.
- Attacks on CZ were too sparse. The warrant stands even if you say there's no number.
- Also, don't put all your eggs in one basket - like 50% of your attacks are "they don't have this."
- Please go in order - you randomly started on C1 at the end of your rebuttal. 😩
- Good summary.

---

**NEB**

- Unnecessary definitions!
- Need much more evidence cited. Give me a list of citations! 😞
- I want more responses to your opponents' case that grant cross applications of your case.
- Spend all 4 minutes of your rebuttal attacking especially since you're 1st rebuttal!
- Make sure to attack all arguments you missed their CZ.
- Solid summary - do more comparisons between your contentions and the Alt Case. -FF - don't make new arguments!

---

**RFD**

I affirm. The Alt contention 1 goes through the round mostly unaddressed, and it supercedes Negro's C1 and C3. The Alt C2 also goes through unaddressed.
Novice Public Forum

Flip: 35 Gonzalez - Sun v. 25 Justice - Hays

Octo-Finals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Sun</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Justice</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Gonzalez</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Hays</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- **Pro**
- **Con**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **Yes**

Judge's Signature

BVHS 7, self-employed

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

```
gave feed back orally

Great debate, best novice debate I've seen.

Main point: your both had cards explaining why GDP would go up or down. Direct clash.

Neither side explained why I should prefer your evidence.

I thought neg was a little confused on a few points, regarding illegal jobs and tax shelters. Also neg evidence a bit stronger.

In a virtual tie, giving to Aff on strength of speaker 2's summary.
```
**Novice Public Forum**

**Speaker** | **Points (20-30)**
---|---
1st Sarwar | 26
2nd Murawehe | 27

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**
- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Crossfire (1 & 2)*: 3 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Crossfire (3 & 4)*: 3 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 2 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min
- 2 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

---

**Pro: Murawehe:**
- Nice development of partner points
- Good intro to topic
- Clearly defined framework
- Persuasive arguments

**Con: Prakash:**
- Need better organized rebuttal
- May provide alternative to do the same as cutting tax
- Prakash needs to develop partner's arguments more
- Good initial counter arguments
- Good definition, framework

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**
Both sides are asking for evidence that are hard to supply.

Con team: only one speaker at a time hard to hear when both asking questions.
Both team: need to watch time more closely went over time several section.

Con: Prakash should practice for smoother delivery.
- Need better organized rebuttal
- May provide alternative to do the same as cutting tax
- Prakash needs to develop partner's arguments more
- Good initial counter arguments
- Good definition, framework

Pro: Murawehe:
- Nice development of partner points
- Good intro to topic
- Clearly defined framework
- Persuasive arguments

---

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **N**