<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 930</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Bolick</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Deng</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro 🟢 Con 🟡

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Y

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Excellent debate - very good direct clash. Very good arguments from the Pro side, but the Con did a very good job of keeping your first contention from flying through. The venture capital aspect of the Pro contention flew through, but the Con did a more convincing job of illustrating through closing loopholes how many of the Pro contentions failed to have as great an impact.
**NPF**

**FLIP: 14 Balachandran - Warrier v. 56 Fernandez - Cencimino**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>David Rice (*4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Fernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Cencimino</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Nice job giving me direct clash.

Good arguments by both sides, but the Pro provided and explained evidence in a way that was more vulnerable in evaluative impact. Overall, the issue of the "lock-in effect" was debated but flowed through for the Pro.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Kevin Diehl (*47)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Flight 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPELY</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Montefalcon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Con</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- So close
- Great spin on what happens to the income when it's not a capital gain.
**Novice Public Forum**

**Kevin Diehl (*47)**

**Round 2**  
**Flight 2**  
**Room 323**  
**Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM**

<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</td>
<td><strong>RAPP</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td><strong>BUDRUK</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>ADDY</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td><strong>CHEN</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

*Remember to follow the flow*

*Stats seemed good from Rapp-Addy*

*Theme was some confusion on what those stats addressed*

*Budruk-Chen had better subject flow. Otherwise, a tie.*
**Novice Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 324</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Soni</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Karthikeyan</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2nd</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:**

Discussed orally after the round.

Aff - lose the IRS coordination, it is weak.

Neg - slippery slope for lives saved.

Neg - 6.8 trillion stat, "over a couple years," try to be more specific.

**Powell** - aggressive cross X good, but you are hurt when your facts aren't accurate.

Aff - you glossed over net long term benefits of tax cuts. Which was the main argument you should focus on.
### Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 324</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Barillas</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ros</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was __Pro__

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? __No__

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- gave oral feedback
- Neg case - dancing on head of a pin. You will give any good team the ammo to beat you.
- also the HFT evidence not consider.
- make it a moral argument.

**Aff:** nice job. You lost on the income tax question, whereas you misspoke twice and allowed them to humiliate you. Get more evidence on positive real world impacts of cutting taxes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 927</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>DESAI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>PANDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>MENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>WALLACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Judge's Signature**

**Bonita Vista**

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Pro**
- More effectively proved their contentions & rebutted the **Con**
- Good questions & answers in cross-X
- DESAI - Good definitions & good job establishing your contentions. Read less, speak to your audience more.
- PANDA - Good eye contact & gestures. You provided a well thought out & effective rebuttle.

**Con**
- Make sure your references are current (CG Tax 28% ?)
- MENG - Good job establishing your contentions. Read less, speak to your audience more. Don’t shake your foot.
- WALLACE - Good job on final focus, read less & speak to your audience more. Use notes more effectively to maintain your train of thought.
# NPF

**FLIP: 3 Pestka - LaCrosse v. 26 Nimbkar - Rivera**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Ronald Stigall (*7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Room 927</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>RIVERA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>NIMBKAR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>(20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>PESTKA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>LACROSSE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>(20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**THE PRO ESTABLISHED A STRONGER CASE AND REBUTTED THE CON BETTER.**

---

**PRO**

RIVERA - GOOD JOB ESTABLISHING YOUR CONTENTIONS, GOOD QUESTIONS IN CROSSFIRE

NIMBKAR - GOOD REBUTtal, GOOD QUESTIONS IN CROSSFIRE, STRONG FINAL FOCUS

---

**CON**

Read less, talk to your audience more. When you looked away from the screens you did well, you know the info!

PESTKA - GOOD JOB ESTABLISHING WELL THOUGHT OUT CONTENTIONS, FORMULATE CROSSFIRE QUESTIONS, ELIMINATE THE "UMS"

LaCROSSE - GOOD REBUTtal, TELL US WHO YOUR REFERENCES ARE TO ESTABLISH THEIR CREDIBILITY (NOT JUST A NAME)
# Novice Public Forum

## FLIP: 14 Schulz - Bysani v. 25 Schillinger - Niederkofler

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 321</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Niederkofler</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Bysani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Schillinger</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Bjo Schulz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

## Comments & Reason for Decision:

1:05 left  
**Pro** Abolish

- Help eco - growth.
- Inc. tax revenue instead of CGT.

**Speaker 2**

- Did not address some of the opponents' contentions.

Pro team did a good job of discrediting opponent's responses and arguments.

**N**

- Strong constructive. Spoke confidently with assurance.
- Be more focused & passionate. Don't sound like you're just thinking aloud.

**S**

Con keep

- Abolishing will help the upper class only.
- Mid class will suffer.
- Eco equality & fairness.

**Speaker 2**

- Addressed contentions of the opponents.
- Didn't use much of time. Could have said much more to argue your point.

B) Good focus. Brought forward strong arguments.

A few times you discredited your own argument in the crossfire.

S) Remember to use up all of your allotted time limit. You should have a lot to say in order to convince someone; don't give up on precious time. Spoke well overall.
# NPF

**FLIP: 56 Prakash - Hausleitner v. 15 Smith - Kellerhals**

## Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 321</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Hausleitner</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Prakash</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2nd</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**
- Abolish
- CGT hurts middle class most
- Imbalance in income equality destabilizes economy
- CGT → & Business link
- Uncollected taxes by IRS will be helped by abolishing CGT
- Upper class exploit loopholes.

Speaker 2

Took each contention spoke about it well. Nothing new in material.
- Advocacy not feasibility.
- Repetitive → should have addressed opponent arguments instead.

- Very powerful speaker.

**Con**
- Keep
- Higher income bracket pays less tax
- CGT encourages tax shelter
- Index all income

Speaker 2 Generalized responses. Arguments not very specific or passionate. Didn't have much to say. Used 1 min less than allocated.

K) Very well prepared.

S) Did well in the final focus.

Responded to opponent's arguments.
In future, use all your time limit to talk as much as you can.

Specific examples of Warren Buffett was a strong argument. Had good strong pt in

constructive. A little weaker in argument overall, it was a very tough fight, and

had a hard time deciding who won!
### Novice Public Forum

**Kyle Henden ("56)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 322</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Gurijal 25.5</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Korpe 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| Speaker | Con | Points (20-30) |
|----------------------|--------|
| 1st | McGee 25 | 2nd | Bustraan 26 |

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Both teams were well-prepared. Both teams will improve with practice and will become more familiar with political topics. There were some misunderstandings on both sides.

The 2nd speaker on both teams spoke at a good speed and had some good eye contact. 1st speaker for pro was too fast.

The pro team was able to sustain a stronger argument.

---

**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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 322</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Villaza</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Humrich</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Both teams were well-prepared, clear speakers. Both teams will grow in confidence with more practice. Keep up the good work!

The Con team was a bit more confident and sustained their argument a little better.
### NPF

**FLIP: 15 Patel - Sajan v. 47 Gay - Lu**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Shawn White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 925</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flight 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (20-30)</td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Patel</td>
<td>25 Lu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Sajan</td>
<td>25 Gay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro did not counter con's any contentions in rebuttal, nor in summary. Just stressing your own arguments is not debate.

Con tried to counter each of pro's contentions, some better than others.

All speakers were pretty good at presenting ideas.

Con's safety net argument is interesting. Isn't it better if you don't have to pay taxes on later gains either?

---

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Speaker</strong></th>
<th><strong>Time</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (1 &amp; 2)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (3 &amp; 4)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Summary</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Summary</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Crossfire (all)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Final Focus</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Final Focus</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

*The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.*
Con's biggest problem is that con proposed a COUNTER PLAN, which is not allowed in PF. Even when this counter plan is not an issue, con put themselves in a position to prove how low is the pivot point, which was never supported. Con were good speakers, but the case failed.

It was hard to debate when both sides essentially agree with each other. Both were good at getting their points through, though. Kim can work on clarity a little more. At current speed, it is not an issue, but should you ever need to speed up, it could have effects.
1. You seem to struggle with questions, but the question about people not on poverty is a good point.

2. High portion of govt? 2-4%
   How much = 1 trillion
   Really good facts and convincing. Most helpful: facts about wealthy and how much from CG they really pocket.

3. Evidence?
   People will go to other countries
   Evidence?

4. 2 mins
   Give the fact about lowering in comes again. You have the time to restate these ideas.

5. 20% of businesses "which businesses? What makes them special?"
   CROSSFIRE

When she asks a question like "what about the people who would go overseas?" Answer w/ evidence to say that would happen?
1. Framework → the other side is **not** saying that we should abolish the tax b/c it is most beneficial to America. Instead of attacking the framework, prove how abolishing it is more beneficial.

---

**CROSSFIRE**

2. "There's no proof... it's all hypothetical."
   - Good point

3. You seem to be saying that smaller businesses aren't able to benefit. It seems like you didn't really mention this a whole lot earlier. You should've.

   This would be a good point to start.

### CON

Has a very good argument w/ a lot of solid evidence. Pro: make sure to hit your evidence strongly from the beginning.
FLIP: 35 Sarwar - Muraweh v. 25 Lomax - Cobb

Novice Public Forum

Round 2

Speaker  Pro  |  Con
---|---|---
1st  | Sarwar  |  26
2nd  | Muraweh |  28

Speaker  Pro  |  Con
---|---|---
(2)  | Cobb  |  22

The winner of this debate was Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Abolish Economic gain tax

• Hinder econ growth
  - Retain investments
  - &

• Entrepreneurship

• Hinder middle class
good speaking skills

• Practice your times
  - By changing the resolution, you have confused the argument that their and now you're both arguing the same thing.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

1. Speaker 1 4 min
2. Speaker 2 4 min
3. Crossfire (1 & 2) 3 min
4. Speaker 3 4 min
5. Speaker 4 4 min
6. Crossfire (3 & 4) 3 min
7. Speaker 5 Summary 2 min
8. Speaker 6 Summary 2 min
9. Grand-crossfire (all) 3 min
10. Speaker 3 Final Focus 2 min
11. Speaker 4 Final Focus 2 min

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
1.) "They want to push for keeping the tax as low as possible." - Good point.

"If you lower the tax and it gets better, then why wouldn't abolishing it be even better?" - Good point.

Pro will win because they proved their case w/ evidence and had great rebuttals. Con: include what benefits the CG tax has.

2.) Talk about the benefits of the tax, instead you're talking about why it's currently too high.

You mentioned it's a good middle bracket where the govt gets money, but the economy still flourishes. This would've been the argument needed earlier. How much money does the govt get? What expenses can they pay w/ them?
**NPF**

**FLIP: 26 Lancaster - Javadpoor v. 35 Gonzalez - Sun**

**NPF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Ryan Robinson (51)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Flight 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 1st</td>
<td>Rick Sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 2nd</td>
<td>Alexander Gonzalez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Pro**

(Circle Winner)

**Con**

Is this a low point win? 

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**S1**
Abolish the capital gains tax more taxes, has highest income in U.S., with facts & numbers. Losing jobs, money moving away from the U.S.

**Con**
- More expensive, less investment from investors.
- Locking effect - avoid selling to avoid taxation, high location of capital income investment in U.S., economy benefit for the poor.
- Good points, good stance, clear, concise speech.

**S2**
- Definitions of the framework, contention - takes spending away from govt. states from going on taxes gained, facts & numbers presented on how spending is helping with security, welfare on other govt. programs, education, banking, etc. where the money is being used was very impressive. Will keep the economy, deficit to be reduced. Had great subpoints & evidence with facts & numbers, very well prepared & put together.

**Crossfire**
- Speaker 2 was unable to clearly back up his assertion for S1 questions.
- Only asked 14 Card should not be the answer, but other questions.
- Backed up the pro team with cards to team Pro team.
- Backed up the Pro team with cards to team Pro team.

**S3**
- More deficit - had 5 points, talking about tax revenue, giving examples, 1997 taxes higher, long-run example.
- In C. Gains, Abolishing will hurt, in long run, by 5% per year, explaining the opponent, Card does not point to.
- Capitulations will cause the deficit. Forcing further the more jobs.
- Capitulations will cause the deficit. Forcing further the more jobs.
- Provided very impressive facts & can be more revenue. S2 provided very impressive facts & can be more revenue. S2 provided very impressive facts & can be more revenue. S2 provided very impressive facts & can be more revenue.
- The speaker used a lot of numbers with increase & decrease effects. The speaker used a lot of numbers with increase & decrease effects. The speaker used a lot of numbers with increase & decrease effects.
- Con's team points & backed answers with examples with options in solutions that prove otherwise.
S4 - opponent contention points stating higher Capital gain is bad. Believing an article, explaining the reason the economy increased in 2003, the second contention term will be more jobs, higher debt & deficit has economic growth, if the deficit should decrease. Alberto & Believing to drop the contention from opponent. Stating the Social security will lead to higher poverty, less starting the Social security will lead to higher poverty, less money for schooling, less grant facts & showing great control on preparation & believing facts.

Crossfire - S3 & S4 - S3 had a question but s4 had to find the card as they had everything pointed. Both had great questions showing both sides equally that their facts had weight in for betterment. Just equally that their facts had weight in for betterment. Having facts & proving could be the only way to get to show & quantify their question. Time in essence and it is important to stay organized.

Speaker 1 Summary - Summary with contrast from increased $1 B, and explaining the cards did not quantify, welfare - does not reduce poverty. How does it help bailing back in United States. Good summary, more jobs, & company's innovating back in United States. Good summary.

Speaker 2 Summary - with opponent points, contents need to organize the thought in the beginning. Driving the point the opponent's view attacked one of the points. It flows through, not a very valued point for summary. Summary can be better put with your opponent's points. Argument is proved better on opponent's points.

Crossfire - Speaker 3 current view does not show going back to their contention. Speaker 4 - current view does not show going back to their contention. Speaker 1 stated in this summary. It is always better to add more from their summary than the summary. Speaker 1 stated in this summary. It is always better to add more from their summary than the summary. How can it improve economy, home reducing the deficit. Can improve economy, their no proof & creating their is a better opportunity with 36.4%.
**Novice Public Forum**

**Pro**

**Con**

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Facts**: Good definition, examples
- **Controversy**: Tax shelters - good, clear, relevant, rich
- **Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

  | Speaker 1 | 4 min | 3:51 |
  | Speaker 2 | 4 min | 3:27 |
  | Crossfire (1 & 2) | 3 min |
  | Speaker 3 | 4 min | 3:52 |
  | 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.*

- **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.*
Si - Started well with framework double taxation, People are discouraged by seeing the Aries, lacking effect. Explaining using examples where it was eliminated.

2 - benefitted.

Grand Crossfire -

Final

Si - using his earlier contentions, needing to increase taxes on both.

and encouraging to vote for their's.

52 - revised points from opponents. Explaining should not be.

Considered. good points, but again basing with facts or examples even on would add more to the debate.
## Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 327</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Julie Kemeny (*35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Pangborn</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Wein</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Clarke</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Both teams did excellent.
- Judge had a very hard time deciding.
- But, I felt that the Pro side was very convincing with their arguments and crossfire.
  - Ex: Supreme Court ruling, Maryland vs Wein.
  - Con team occasionally had an issue finding their argument and coming on computer but had some great points (ex: Double Taxation in fact legal).

---

**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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 327</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Goswick</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Pulliam</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aksh K.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Aditya K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro Goswick Con Pulliam
(Circle Winner) 

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Goswick and Pulliam won because they had very strong arguments and the evidence to back it up.
- Both teams were excellent, Aditya can work on finding his information a little bit quicker in crossfire, but he still did an amazing job.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker 1</th>
<th>Speaker 2</th>
<th>Crossfire (1 &amp; 2)</th>
<th>Speaker 3</th>
<th>Speaker 4</th>
<th>Crossfire (3 &amp; 4)</th>
<th>Speaker 1 Summary</th>
<th>Speaker 2 Summary</th>
<th>Grand Crossfire (all)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
Pro - just because he is cut does not make him right. You said it way too many times. Simply because his temperament is rude.

Con - work on your disposition. You came off code.

You had a very strong constructive speech. You ignored it to make a very weak welfare point that your opponents effectively took down in Speaker 1's speech. You should have stuck by rest of their speech. Instead, you dropped their entire case to continually try to uphold their weak and partitioned welfare contention.

Bobcat Bonanza 2018
Very Messy Round
**TRISTANO, MIKE**  
King, James (54)

**NPF**

Bobcat Bonanza 2018

**FLIP: 29 Wong - Karanjia v. 25 Justice - Hays**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Mike Tristano (*58)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Hays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Wong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Karanjia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

```
Best speakers I've seen today. Both sides.
In a very close round, with lots of excellent hits on either end, 1 singular distinction was made by Hays (pro) - GDP goes up when you cut CC. This unravels any block about loss of tax revenue. This singular, and uncontested point gives Pro the win. Great Job!
```
**NPF**

FLIP: 35 Pejavar - Mukherjee v. 16 LaRosa - Wormell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Kat Fowler (*25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 926</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(20-30)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pejavar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukherjee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature: **Perry HS**

School / Affiliation / Occupation:

Comments & Reason for Decision:

---

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.
# Novice Public Forum

## Kat Fowler (*25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 926</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Chang</td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Stefan</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**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.