<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 322</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 07:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Ryne Bolick</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ben Deng</td>
<td>30</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:

You guys all did a great job with a very heady topic. You all have a lot of potential and will be excellent varsity debaters. Deng - you had some very solid analysis and good argumentation. Deng + Ryne - do not read from paper. Look the judge in the eye and analyze the points you're making. Niederkofler - make sure your computer is down below your face when you read your case. Okay - I voted Pro because my case is inherently flawed and does not follow the resolution. You actually helped their case. I wish you all the best of luck and I know you will all be successful varsity debaters.
### Novice Public Forum

**Kevin Diehl (*'47)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 322</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 07:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Emma Baldwin</td>
<td>(20-38)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Alex Clarke</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Bedre Hunseman</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Linus Ros</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The winner of this debate was Con**

**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

---

**Notes:**

Emma - Great job with your case. Very clear & great delivery. Both sides: try to use crossfire to ask questions that will help you build your argument & strengthen your case. Should be more than asking for evidence. Linus - Wow! You demonstrate great understanding of the topic & did a very solid, well argued speech. Alex - You are an excellent speaker. Very impressed by your speaking ability & analysis.

Bedre - Nice job flowing through all votes! I voted No because Pro told me my one V1 was econ. I think Pro was confused about CG capital gains - this IS for individuals or small biz. I also think the trickle down & 2008 subprime argument were muddled. I feel the neg best argued their case & understood the subject matter best.
## NPF

**FLIP: 56 Prakash - Hausleitner v. 35 Sypher - Powell**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Bennett Harnisch (*'14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>HAUSLEITNER</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>PRAKASH</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

![Pro](认定)  ![Con](认定)

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**CON**

**H:** GREAT TONE & CLARITY COULDN'T RESOLVE THAT YOU WERE SICK, COULDN'T USE MORE BODY LANGUAGE, BUT THAT PROBABLY THE FAULT OF YOUR BIG WHITE NOTEBOOK AND NOT YOU

**S:** A JOY TO LISTEN TO, CALM, DELIBERATE, AND CHARISMATIC. EYE CONTACT, GESTURE, ETC. KEEP IT UP!

**PRO**

**H:** GREAT SPEAKING VOICE, BUT THE SPEED OF YOUR CONSTRUCTIVE SPEECH MADE IT DIFFICULT TO LISTEN TO AND RESTRICTED YOUR ABILITY TO USE POSTURE/BODY LANGUAGE

**S:** STRESSED HUMAN IMPACTS OF LOSS OF REVENUE. IS IT ALRIGHT TO TAKE AWAY MONEY FROM EMERGENCY SERVICES? *LOL*

**P:** AWESOME RANGE OF EXPRESSION AND GESTURE, GREAT SPEAKING PRESSURE. A LITTLE DIFFICULTY FINDING YOUR SOURCES CAUSED SOME AWKWARDNESS. DON'T BE AFRAID TO USE PREP TO GET THAT STUFF ORGANIZED.

---

**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.
SUMM:
1. Hurts middle class
2. Long-term economic growth
3. Help the IRS

"Opponent provided no attacks"
Key: Not really true. Don't exaggerate to make it sound good.

No key points or weighing...

FINAL FOCUS

IMPACTS
- More jobs
- Small biz/jobs → due to investment
- Income ineq. down
- IRS efficiency
- Regent-replacement program...
- Wont be any harm to govt. programs because Rep. so small
- Poverty is a slippery slope

ARG: No link

SUMM:

PRO
- Income ineq. →
- Hurts small business →
- Lock-in effect → Not real
- 63 trillion $ →
- Only helps top 10%
- No response → to 2 & 3
- Also not true

Key Voter 1: Econ
Key Voter 2: Lives

Great Recession" → Kind of dramatic
Y'all really like saying "non-unique"

F.F.: F/W: Econ. & Lives
More harm than good
- Poverty causes bad stuff
- Takes money from govt. programs
- IRS doesn't weigh

Very confrontational & not very constructive crossfire

RED: Very good at stressing your impacts and staying consistent. Good structure.
**Pro**

H: I liked your tone and volume, but loosen up a bit. Use your hands & body language.

S: Excellent enunciation. Rush a little too much. You could cover the same ground and be more convincing. Good hand gestures.

**Summary:**

FW: The people!

- Uneven taxation
- Free up money in economy Switz.
- Lock-in & Double taxation

**Con**

F: I can tell you have a good voice, but not because you used it. Be confident! Speak loudly! Move a little. Use more eye contact.

C: I liked your speaking voice. Good body language & gestures. Keep it up.

**Summary:**

FW: The people!

KU1: Disenfranchised lower class.
- Poor is getting poorer.
- Less money for gun to spend on welfare.

KU3: Status quo is OK.

FW includes the people! Disenfranchised double tax
RFD: I found you were more consistent with your impacts and were more effective at defending your key points.

FF: I agree. The people + econ. will be stronger with more investment.

No evidence it will hurt the poor, no link to welfare.

Weigh double tax / poor hurt? Not true.

Don't provide alternative solutions:

- Their KIVs have been rebutted
- No double taxation
- No lock-in alternative provided

- We got impacts
  - Find healthcare
  - Stop poverty

Our FW is cool.

Cut it out with the card date comparison.
## Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Brandon Ferderer (*58)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Epley</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Montefalcon</td>
<td>27</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>Pangborn</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Wein</td>
<td>26</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**: Good debate overall, while the Con team was balanced, the Pro did end up winning the round
- **Con**: The Pro's arguments were well supported with studies and evidence. The Pros counter well in all the crossfires.
## Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Brandon Ferederer (*'58)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Frey</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Cordero</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Festka</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>LaCrosse</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(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**: Well organized in putting across arguments in favor of their case.

**Con**: Brought out points contention did not include clarification. Speaker's delivery was great. She brought up flaws with opp arguments while making her arguments for Con.

In crossfires, the speaker was articulate in her response.

The final focus included the highlights of their arguments and showed how their opp's arguments may not work.

Comments: Good debate. Overall, the Con team were articulate and their delivery was great. They were also good in crossfire rounds.
**Novice Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 926</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 07:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Diya Balachandran</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Meghana Warrior</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? [x]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

On Speaker 2. Make sure you go line 30. Go down line 32. Imagine your face or either... This is fine if you don't have cards

On. Make sure you casier their arguments down. Just repeat their arguments with all of your points.

Pro: Economy must become the heart of state not God. You need to say the federal God. You need also explain the implications of your core in theory.

Low Point on hypothetical counter.

I like the sustained arguments about economic growth
**NPF**

**FLIP: 25 Justice - Hays v. 35 Hsu - Kim**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Chris Flores (*42)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Daniel Hsu 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Jason Kim 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Carl Justice 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>William Hays 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**.

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

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro: Good War Cox & Explanation in Crossfire.

Pro: Sum 2. I think you would go more clear if you

your answers to Pro's Terms in your

speech. Your speech was

Pro: Good Argument in the counter in Crossfire

as it was not clear or magnetic. Speaker

need to be more clear next.

Con: You need to have more time & cash

both in Pro proving it at the hours of for

case law, more largely understood

their counter. A lot more to be had clear

arguments. Much more so than this by how

HCF.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McHenry</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Round 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadegi</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Flight 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner) **No**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Spk 1: Sadegi - fumbled through some words. Did not establish eye contact w/audience. Could slow down on speech rate.

Spk 2: McHenry - Great projection of voice. Intention of exploiting their opponent's weakness was there; however, better construction of facts and/or reasons as to why their stance was stronger could have been better.

Spk 1: Pejavar - spoke very clearly and ensured to look up at audience. Data was very well-presented and delivery was effective. Cause and effect of points mentioned were very clear.

Spk 2: Mukherjee - had a lot that wanted to say but was trying to say too fast. W/C caused him to mumble or repeat himself repeatedly. W/C impacted the effectiveness of stance. Did a good job making eye-contact w/audience.
1st speaker Sarwar: spoke very clearly, established eye-contact with audience. Clearly stated each point made and provided great statistical support for each.

2nd speaker Muraweh: very well spoken and provided very good reasoning and support to her claims. Spoke at a very good pace - not too fast, not too slow. Good job.

1st speaker Fernandez: established eye-contact, tended to tap feet. Points made were well-prepared.

2nd speaker Cencimino: outstanding job in speech - right pace while expressing each point made in a very effective and conveying manner.

Th, sides could have been a bit more aggressive in exploiting their opponent's weaknesses. Due to this, Pro only had a very minimal edge on Con. Both sides I'm sure will continue to improve.
## NPF

**FLIP: 3 Chang - Stefan v. 5 Meng - Wallace**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 927</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 07:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MENG</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td><strong>CHANG</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>WALLACE</strong></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>STEFAN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Specific to the subject, explained the points made with evidence.

---

**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.
## NPF

**FLIP: 54 Lifshitz - Vaillancourt v. 14 Schulz - Bysani**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 927</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Schulz</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Bysani</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Vaillancourt</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Lifshitz</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro  **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Provided the recency reasoning and explanation to the case in multiple scenarios.

Schulz - Started very well and made a good point. Would have added more points to prove the case.

### 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.
**NPF**

FLIP: 56 Karthikeyan - Soni v. 7 Yniguez - Perez

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Mike Welty (*'25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Flight 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yniguez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room 324</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 07:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karthikeyan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

Judge's Signature

Engineer

School / Affiliation / Occupation

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Pro**

Speaker 1

- Made good points on the Pro's case.
- Good job of covering the opponent's contention.
- Made good job of countering the opponent's contentions for Pro's case.

Speaker 2

- Made good points on the Pro's case.
- Spoke clearly. Looked at the audience while speaking which is good.
- The contention that removing CGT causes bad investment was weak and not supported with data.

**Con**

Speaker 1

- Made good points on the Con's case.
- Spoke clearly. Looked at the audience while speaking which is good.
- The contention that removing CGT causes bad investment was weak and not supported with data.

Speaker 2

- Encouraged the speaker to take part in Grand crossfire. Speaker 2 was silent.

Overall the 'Pro' team was more convincing and provided better empirical evidence to support their contention on how removing CGT promotes economic growth, jobs and hence does not cause more income inequality or hurt Social Spending or Social Services tax revenue...
NOVICE PUBLIC FORUM

Mike Welty (*25)

Round 3  | Flight 2  | Room 324  | Fri 01/26/18 07:15PM
---|---|---|---
Speaker  | Pro | Points (20-30) | 1st | Villano | 26 |
| 2nd | Humrich | 26 |

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

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

Speaker 1
- Spoke very clearly
- Mentioned good pts to support the Pro case. Good pt. about the double taxation
- The part about unconstitutional vs illegal was not very convincing.
- The speaker summary was weak.

Speaker 2
- Good job covering the opponents contention for the negotiation & also explaining double taxation. Personal funding vs govt funding impact on innovation & economic growth
- I felt speaker could have spoken a little faster to cover more pts.

Con

Speaker 1
- Spoke very clearly
- The contention pts were very well presented to support the "Con"
- Good example about the income range for 20 people paying CGT in that income range.

Speaker 2
- Good job Countering opponents contention for the affirmative
- Spoke very clearly
- Good summary of the contention supporting the "Con"

Overall the "Con" team was more convincing in defending their contentions on how abolishing CGT can hurt govt spending on infrastructure and also how removing CGT will benefit the rich more.
In debate, like in a courtroom, you face the judge while speaking. Please.

You have to speak louder than the evil air conditioners.

Pro - covering your face with computer during rebuttal the whole time you aren't telling me where you are going. You are just reading evidence - I have no idea what you are attacking with this.

Your case is both of yours - it isn't individual. ??!!
<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>Rick Sun</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Rebi Budruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Alexander Gonzalez</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Angela Chen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro.

Is this a low point win? No.

Orders/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: 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min
- Total Prep Time: 2 min

*The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

Lots of income tax discussion, which can be effective, but you (con) must link in to this is what world is IF CGT is abolished. Be clearer with this. They are turning on you because it wasn’t fully explained.

Everyone — look at judge when speaking, like in a court, not at each other.

The Con summary didn’t mention Laffer curve, which Con F.F. is all about. You dropped this argument so you can’t go back to it.

I vote Pro on Econ benefits — jobs + $
Both teams had their arguments well prepared. Each cancelled out one of the others arguments/contend. Good job.

The stronger contention left standing belonged to Pro.
Both teams were well prepared. Speaker 2 on the Con team was a bit short on her first term. All contentions were good and both teams were able to counter most successfully. The contention that stood was Pro Amt 2 is a small business. It was well researched and went un rebutted.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both teams were well prepared. Speaker 2 on the Con team was a bit short on her first term. All contentions were good and both teams were able to counter most successfully. The contention that stood was Pro Amt 2 is a small business. It was well researched and went un rebutted.

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 |

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>David Floyd (*'16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Oldani</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Reed</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro offered some points/contention that were not really supported by their quotations and by common facts.

Con clearly made points. Also, good grasp of the problems with Pro's counter.

Pro: not a good strategy to say something your opponent didn't address, or issue they did.

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 3</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 930</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 07:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Pulliam</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1st Pro2,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Goswick</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2nd Harrison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Con:** Obesity quite an interesting and diverse attention, but be sure you understand how the parts of the pro-pro argument fit or it will be easy to trip you up.

**Pro & Con:** It doesn’t profit to refute what you believe to be an assertion with another assertion of your own. e.g. China v. US. econ

ObamaCare v. ObamaCare
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 925</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 07:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Nimbkar</strong></td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Rivera</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Pro**

(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.

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Winners by default.

Other Team did not show up.

10 Shams - Islam

NO SHOW

DEFAULT - FORFEIT
**NPF**

**Novice Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 925</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 07:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1st Gurijala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Damir</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2nd Korpe</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 an excellent job.
- It was a very tough decision.
- But, the determining factor for me was that Korpe forgot which side she was arguing for.

**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>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>Kellerhals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Javadpoor</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro

(Circle Winner)

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

**RFD:**
- Pro has limited cards
- Pro summary doesn't extend or flow
- No new evidence in summary
- Pro needs to go on offense, not just repeat case
- No link to deficit importance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 326</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 07:15PM</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>Nair</td>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Zonn</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro □ Con □
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ________

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.